THE NEW PRINCETON REVIEW.

61st Year. NOVEMBER, 1886. No. 6.

THE MODERN NOVEL.

THOSE who mourn, while they deny, the existence of new methods in fiction, utter their deepest lamentations over the absence from the work of modern men of something better, nobler, and grander than life. They maintain with great unanimity that it is this loftier principle that is the essential quality of art; that those who fail to seek it are artisans of poor degree; and that to the artist alone is vouchsafed a vision of what, to be sure, is not, but might be. This grand, if remote, inspiration, it is held, is abandoned by later writers, and these degenerate scribblers thereby degrade themselves below their predecessors, who reserved their highest flights for the purer ether which was not contaminated by the vulgarity of real life. The reality is hopelessly low, and the business of art is to polish it into a presentable, inoffensive shape; such is their judgment, and it may, perhaps, be worth while to examine few of the steps by which this aristocratic notion of the supremacy of the ideal grew and began to fade, if one may say that so widespread a notion has begun to fade.

I.

It is in the romantic novel that we find full expression given to the desire to represent something greater than life, and it is in Horace Walpole's *Castle of Otranto* that we may trace the crude beginnings of a vast movement. To us of the present day this story is very nearly unreadable; it has more the air of a caricature than of a genuine attempt to attract adult readers, and this feeling was

shared by many of the author's contemporaries. What was absurd in its gigantic helmet and childish terrors seemed also absurd to them, but there were others who justified the writer's assertion: "I have not written the book for the present age, which will endure nothing but *cold common sense*. . . . I have composed it in defiance of rules, of critics, and of philosophers; and it seems to me just so much better for that very reason." In other words, Walpole, a delicate, fastidious man, familiar with what was going on in France as well as England, despised by his countrymen for what seemed like ridiculous affectation, in his finical love for antiquities and Gothic architecture, and for his indifference to the rough amusements of a rude time, was, in fact, simply anticipating his age by his dissatisfaction with the meagre reasonableness of its view of life. The success of his book and the enormous extent of its influence showed that he was on the right path in his laughable revolt. It was long before the ghost that left its gigantic helmet and sword about in his book was laid. It became a stock figure of romance, and even when, as in Mrs. Radcliffe's novels, the ghost itself evaporated into explicable phenomena, the grisly terror that his presence or neighborhood inspires remained a most useful source of entertainment.

But at all times the life of a ghost is a hard one; he is at the best a pretender, and his few resources soon render him as conventional an object as can well be conceived. Then, too, all ghosts are alike; whoever has seen one has seen all, and, seen too often, they lose their miraculousness—their sole stock in trade—and become commonplace. This is what happened to them; no one believed in them, no one was terrified by them; and they soon returned to their limbo, whence they issue in these degenerate days only for a brief season, in the old-fashioned Christmas stories, along with other methods of infantile amusement.

Yet, even apart from this shadowy survival, the poor creature did not wholly die; his spirit remained in the new affection felt for his surroundings, and in the general impression that there was left an element of mystery in human beings. The dungeon keeps, the trap-doors, cloisters, and oratories were at first recalled to men's attention on the ground that they were the favorite resort of ghosts, but their grandeur and gloom lingered even when cleared of these beings, and in the same way it began to be perceived by gradual stages that it was not essential to a hero's importance that he should have died before the story began, and living people took the place of

their deceased ancestors. Thus the crude beginning of romance opened the way for an enormous widening of men's sympathies and interests. It accomplished this result, it must be noticed, in the force of bitter opposition. As Sir Walter Scott says, in his life of Mrs. Radcliffe: "It was the cry at the period, and has sometimes been repeated since, that the romances of Mrs. Radcliffe, and the applause with which they were received, were evil signs of the times, and argued a great and increasing degradation of the public taste, which, instead of banqueting as heretofore on scenes of passion, like those of Richardson, or of life and manners, like those of Smollett and Fielding, was now coming back to the fare of the nursery, and gorged upon the wild and improbable fictions of an overheated imagination." Certainly, those who defended the position of Fielding and Richardson stood on firm ground, but it would be a lamentable thing if the impossible had happened, and men had thought that the only way to advance was by standing still. The romanticism which is the main-stay of the legitimate descendants of those who denounced Mrs. Radcliffe would never have come into existence at all.

II.

Obviously, we are far from the flourishing estate of the romantic novel when we look back to its remote ancestry in these fantastic visions "of an overheated imagination," from which it soon escaped, giving to the world a great number of inspiring visions of fascinating interest. As its admirers say, it drew pictures not of what was so much as of what might be. It rose superior to the vulgar fact in the possession of the highest truth, and it is generally in the portrayal of the hero that this distinction showed itself. This eminent being has appeared in various forms in fiction and poetry, but throughout it will be observed that he possesses one marked trait, namely, his aristocratic superiority to ordinary people. The romantic movement was not a perfectly simple one; it brought into prominence the despised and neglected past at the same time that it found new dignity in the present, but in both cases there was a striking similarity; the quality of the mediæval man-at-arms who was restored, like the old buildings that he once inhabited, bore a close resemblance to that of the humble person who was elevated into unexpected prominence. This new being at once manifested his importance by the display of real grandeur. While his sur-

roundings were commonplace, he himself was anything but commonplace. In him the world saw a being who outdid the aristocracy on its own ground, that of exceptional interest; and nowhere is this plainer than in the gentle-hearted murderers, the honest thieves, the innocent criminals, who appear in the novels of Victor Hugo and Bulwer. Some of these new heroes combined both charms; they were both mediæval and virtuously vicious. But these narrow distinctions need not be examined too closely at the present time; what underlay them all was the new tendeney to see everything through the emotions, and to produce this effect various paraphernalia of picturesque setting were adapted from the past, from foreign countries, or from unknown corners of home. Through the emotions one saw a new richness in life, an unsuspected beauty and significance in the humblest, and learned how unjust had been the simplicity of the work of the previous century. Sometimes the setting alone sufficed, as in Scott's *Lay of the Last Minstrel*, with its charming bits from the Middle Ages, and its incomprehensible plot, if plot there be. In time, however, the novel, which in Scott's hands had shown how full of beauty was the world, whether past or near, began to receive the impression of the special interests that were making themselves felt in the fermentation of modern society, and this was the case especially with Bulwer and Victor Hugo. Scott's inexhaustible readiness made over the novel to a thing of world interest; and not the novel alone, but history itself was altered and elevated, from a chronicle to a representation of splendid performance and gorgeous pageantry. With his successors we find appearing the application of his methods to current questions.

Let us take Bulwer's *Paul Clifford* as a fair example of this author's treatment of the questions which were most prominent at about 1830. The hero of this story, it will be remembered, as a result of keeping bad company, is arrested and condemned for robbery of which he is innocent, and in his imprisonment he acquires much vicious knowledge. The result is that, when he is free again, he sets to work robbing freely. His misdeeds are many. Yet, with all that, he is at heart a very good man; he is no way tainted by his crimes. On the contrary, he is an exceptionally innocent and worthy man, who is the victim of unjust social conditions. He falls happily in love with a lady of refinement, and continually shows his superiority to her usual companions, who, nevertheless, have avoided the clutches of the law. Finally, he is

caught, tried, convicted, and sentence of death is passed upon him by the judge who had already started him on his downward career by his first sentence. By an even stranger coincidence this judge turns out to be the hero's own father, and the scene swiftly becomes harrowing. Soon, however, Paul is pardoned; he betakes himself to America, where he becomes a judge himself, and he makes full restitution of their property to those whom he had robbed in his prime. It is not as a representation of probabilities that this book will ever be recommended; it is only the most romantic criminal who can expect to have such luck. But it would be idle to point out the many sturdy impossibilities that fill the book—it will be sufficient to say that those who demand that a novel shall contain not life, but something greater than life, something rarer, not bound down by likelihood, but only limited by possibility, have here what they want, and in generous abundance.

Yet it would be rash to say that Bulwer here consciously drew an inexact picture, as it would be to say that Raphael was guilty of intentional and criminal perversion of historical facts when he designed his School of Athens, and assembled his philosophers with but little regard for dates or historical accuracy. The exaggeration in Bulwer's story is simply the measure of his enthusiasm and of the stolidity of the public. He called attention to a matter of great importance, the condition of the criminal classes, and if he raised his voice, it was to give a needed alarm. To accuse him of wilful exaggeration would be as if a paralytic were to accuse firemen, hastening to a fire, of eccentricity, because they did not maintain the usual moderation of gait that characterizes decorous citizens. The outbreak of romanticism was like the breaking of a dam, where the waters, suddenly let loose, whirl and foam wildly, in a manner very unlike the placidity of the peaceful canal. The turmoil in the one case is just as natural as the calmness in the other. The presence of froth and foam does not necessarily indicate an artificial churning of the waters, nor yet, it may be said, does it make one sure that an artificial churning of the waters is a desirable thing.

III.

The same rapturous enthusiasm inspired a great many writers, who agreed, whatever their subject, in recommending it by insistence upon its emotional value. In the general widening of men's interests, which was one of the most characteristic qualities of the first half of

the nineteenth century, every new subject was urged as if it were the only one. In the tumultuous excitement only a loud voice could be heard, and every advocate presented the claims of the object he had in view as if it were the only one. In this way, the world grew to a new consciousness of many things—of confused social relations, of the pathos of poverty, the sweetness and charm of childhood, the efforts of women to abandon the condition of servitude, as in the writings of George Sand and Charlotte Brontë; men learned from Victor Hugo and Bulwer that criminals were not wholly bad, and from many writers that the old conventions of society were far from being wholly satisfactory; that true dignity did not depend on social position. Nothing is more curious than a comparison between the novels that conveyed these momentous truths and the cooler writings of those men who said the same things in another way, as we may see in the ingenious article in a recent number of *Macmillan's Magazine*, where the credit of writing Dickens's novels is ascribed to Herbert Spencer, in ridicule of the Bacon-Shakespeare hypothesis.

While there was a similarity in the general aim of the novelists, there was a more marked sameness of method. These lessons were conveyed through parables, and the hero absorbed the writer's utmost care as well as the reader's earnest attention. He was designed to convey one truth, and to make that truth irresistible. If it was necessary in order to carry conviction that he should be handsome, there was no fleck upon his beauty. If he was ugly, he was hopelessly ugly, and this quality gave him only an additional piquancy. Whatever he was, he was not commonplace, for the newly discovered richness of life took no cognizance of the commonplace, and that is something that falls out of sight when every one is eager and impassioned. Yet with time it will be noticed that there grew up a calmer method, which did not depend on a high key for its efficiency. It began to be perceived that complexity of tints existed more frequently than a single undiluted hue, and that even the raw combination of two qualities, as in Victor Hugo's Lucrezia Borgia, did not exhaust the resources of nature. This change coincided with a modification in the views of the public. The red-cheeked generosity of Dickens's Brothers Cheeryble was contemporary with the notion that misery was to be relieved by the simple process of putting the hand in the pocket and withdrawing a coin. At the present day, only old-fashioned people are guilty of this selfish reck-

lessness; the approved method disdains this pernicious system, and what once secured the general attention by a direct appeal to the emotions has become very different before the results of scientific investigation. And what is true of charity is true of many other subjects: a more thorough examination has taught men the greater complexity of what was simple enough when only looked at in emotional excitement. The raw notion that rustics are the finest people in the world, as preached by Auerbach and George Sand, was a useful lesson; the way in which it was inculcated is characteristic of the general manner of the romantic novel, for simple village girls, as in *On the Heights*, were shown to possess to a high degree all the qualities that it had been supposed were the results of cultivation—they outdid the aristocrats on their own ground. But now the innocent, simple rustic is better known in fiction than in real life, and the lesson, once necessary, that they are human beings, has brought them on a plane with the rest of the world, and shown that they too possess mingled faults and merits, not alone unblemished virtues.

These discoveries of the incompleteness of emotional excitement as a panacea for the world's woes renders the faultless hero an anomaly, a mere inherited convention, and with the diminution of his solitary grandeur the splendor of his surroundings began to fade away. This was a slow process, and it is far from complete. As we know, there are those who cling by precept and practice to what they acknowledge is usual; and it is a fatal admission which they make, for when it flourished it was as a real thing that it held its ground. In Balzac, from whom modern realists trace their descent, we may see the copy of life mingled, as was inevitable, with the most extravagant romanticism, as in the *Femme de Trente Ans*, with its excellent beginning and its wild ending. A more curious instance of the tenacious life of the old principle is to be seen in *Silas Marner*. The hero of the story was, it will be remembered, an old miser who used to count his gold on his hearth. One night he seeks his treasure, and it is gone. Some time afterward he enters the room and sees something glistening before the fire. His sight is dim, and he thinks his gold has been returned as mysteriously as it was taken away. But no, it is the golden hair of a little girl who becomes dearer to him than mountains of treasure, etc., etc. And this fantastic enforcement of a simple lesson is set in a series of most realistic pictures, which do not depend on allegory for their impressiveness. In George Eliot's

later work these devices are less frequently employed, as their need was less urgently felt. In Hawthorne's *Rappacini's Daughter*, a resemblance is noticed between the evil-doer and a beautiful but noxious flower. It is not always necessary to inculcate the objectionable side of wickedness by these unmistakable processes, any more than it is for a capable artist, when he paints a horse, to label it in capital letters. Yet those who do this in literature are said to be the sole possessors of imagination. Certainly, they do not credit their readers with any. In Zola, again, we see the perpetual struggle of a would-be realist with the romanticism in which he was nurtured. The violence and intensity of his pictures of crime and misery are made up by those excessive methods of romanticism which was most eager to destroy. When the writers who most detest the exaggeration of a hero's importance thus commit the very crime which they denounce, it is not surprising that readers should still cling to obsolescent theories, and should feel a repugnance to reading about people who lack impossible qualities. They are so accustomed to being invited by novelists to enjoy the society of those who, whether for good or evil, are undeniably great, that the company of ordinary people repels them as if it were a vague aspersion on their own gentility. They make no claim to the possession of transcendent merit on their own part, but they have a lurking consciousness of their keen appreciation of rare traits in others, and undisguised contempt for heroes without a single angelic or demoniac quality. It is to be noticed, however, that the reason commonly assigned for this preference of unreality is that this falsity, at least, teaches readers to believe in an ideal. But is this defence actually sound? Do not the lessons of life teach us this? Are we compelled to turn to novels to learn how to comport ourselves? And if life itself can instruct mankind without pretence, it is hard to see why pictures of it have to be falsified before they can produce a good effect. Certainly, it is hard to understand how the consciousness of inexactness in the lesson can confer serious moral improvement.

IV.

Since we may see the romantic novel, when in its prime, coinciding with the general view of men with regard to social and political questions, it may be permissible to conjecture that there can be no serious divergence between the present condition of thought and its purely literary expression. This presumption is further justified

by the fact that we nowhere can find such divergence, any more than we can find a time when men's views were changing, without intense opposition on the part of those who maintained the superiority of what went before. At the present time, a most important moulder of men's thoughts is the scientific movement. Science is taking possession, not of the material world alone, but of the intellectual and moral; and many questions, once settled by the feelings alone, are now subjected to very different tests. This statement will probably be acknowledged without discussion. If an instance is called for, the present condition of history may serve to show how different nowadays are men's views of the past from what they were a century or a generation ago. And a change in one's views of the past is very apt to modify one's views of the present, and the greater attention that is given to what were once regarded as obscure and trivial matters, in remote times, helps to show their importance now. It has become clear that it was not always what appears to us as the picturesqueness of antiquity which was the most important element in the history of the past, and this truth may be fruitful when it is applied to other and later days. In fact, to the eyes of science nothing is trivial; its sole question is, Is it true?

The picturesqueness, of which at one time so much was made, has done excellent service by attracting men's attention to a vast number of subjects which had long languished in neglect, and every investigator busied himself with proclaiming the preciousness of his discoveries. The mediæval as well as the Sanscrit epics were finer than the Homeric; Gothic architecture far surpassed any other that was known; in the Middle Ages every estimable virtue flourished, and the result was that this early fervor was succeeded by more serious examination of the period, which now is studied thoroughly, with no pretence that the period was the long-sought Golden Age, just as no immigrant expects to find the Fountain of Youth in the western part of this country. In the same way, the belief in the romantic picturesqueness of human nature is succeeded by more careful analysis of emotions and passions, in accordance with the inevitable process whereby primal enthusiasm is succeeded by cooler examination. It would be rash to say that either is better than the other, for each does but mark a stage in the world's history.

The scientific spirit moves, too, in another way: we have seen the aristocratic tinge inherent in romanticism; in realism it is easy

to notice the tendency toward democracy. The objection, to the study of any character, that it is vulgar, is as idle as would be sneering at a botanist for examining a roadside weed; he does not spend his time solely over garden or hothouse flowers, any more than a chemist devotes himself to nothing but sweet-smelling objects.

The qualities thus existing in the scientific movement of the present day go also to the composition of the modern novel, which in this way has at least the merit of being abreast with the times, in spite of the efforts of those who would like to set it back for about fifty years. Fiction is but one resultant of the complicated forces that combine to make society, for it only expresses the hopes, wishes, and aims of men as they exist at any given time. When men think differently, the novel will be different; but if history teaches anything, it teaches this: that men will move forward, whether to good or ill, rather than move backward. To affirm that they have attained perfection now is as idle as to affirm that they attained it half a century ago, and the assertion would simply define the judgment of the person who made it. If every one believes that flawless characters are the only true ones, novels will contain only flawless characters; but if it is necessary for people to pretend that they have such a belief, only sham novels, written artificially, will bear that decoration. These exist now, because there are always plenty of people whose literary, social, and political theories and sympathies lag fifty years or more behind their times, but they are not the world's great novelists, the men who are breathing the air of to-day.

THOMAS SERGEANT PERRY.

REALISM: ITS PLACE IN THE VARIOUS PHILOSOPHIES.

THERE are three marked methods or tendencies in the various philosophic systems, ancient and modern.

There is Realism, which holds that there are things and that man can know them. In a crude form it is the first philosophy, which is a generalization in an uncritical, undistinguishing manner of what seem primary truths. This is soon discovered to be unsatisfactory, and the speculative intellect adds to it to make it attractive; hence

There is Idealism, which is Realism dressed and ornamented by the mind out of its own stores. There are shrewd minds which notice the additions; so

There is Scepticism, which doubts of or denies received doctrines. This may be total, affirming that truth cannot be found, or partial, denying certain truths. Its most prevalent form is Agnosticism, which allows us to follow certain practical maxims, but has no faith in any supersensible truth.

Some thinkers were interested to observe that the NEW PRINCETON REVIEW, in its Prospectus, avowed itself a defender of Realism. This, in a raw form, is the first, in a digested form will be the final, philosophy.

But what is Realism? In answering this question we may seem to be explaining what does not need, what does not seem to admit of, explanation. Some may resent our statement; they feel as if it were an insult to their understandings, and as if we were addressing them as children. It is true that we cannot give an explanation of reality, which may explain other things, but itself needs no explanation; but we may so enunciate it as to separate it from ideas, imaginations, and everything else.

"We know," which means that we know "things." This is the fact with which the intelligent mind starts, and this is the first position which metaphysical philosophy, as expressing primary facts, should lay down. We cannot explain either of the terms, "know" and "things," to one who does not know them already. Those who know them, as all intelligent beings do, do not need to have them

interpreted. We may say "knowing is knowing," and that "things are things," in this or in synonymous phraseology; but this does not add to our knowledge. When we wish to think of them we have only to look to what is passing or has passed in our minds. When we speak of them to others, we have only to appeal to what they, as well as we, have experienced.

While we cannot give a positive definition, we may lay down many negative positions (as Aristotle shows can be done in such cases), as to what they are not, to meet errors which have sprung up. We can say of knowing that it is not mere feeling; of things—say of external things—that they are not the result of reasoning; not only so, we may make some historical assertions regarding them which are not definitions: that they appear in infancy; that we are never without them; that they mingle with all our states of mind, with our thoughts, feelings, and volitions, with even our imaginations, which are all about things which we have in some sense known.

The knowledge of Being, that is, of things having being, is what the intelligence starts with. Knowing and Being are the first objects contemplated in the first philosophy. They are to be assumed, not proven. They may be premises, but they are not conclusions of arguments. If we attempt to prove them, we shall find that we cannot do so. While metaphysics cannot prove their reality, it can show that we may and ought to assume them.

The "thing" and "the knowledge of the thing" are not the same, and should never be confounded. There may be growing, in the depths of a forest, a flower which never fell under the notice of human intelligence. It should be noticed that there is an important class of cases in which the thing is known by itself; thus, the self is known by the self. But the two are different aspects of the one thing.

The thing may be known directly and at once, as we say, by intuition. It is thus we know ourselves as thinking or feeling. But the object may become known mediately, say by induction and classification, as when, knowing that all mammals are warm-blooded, we know at once that the cow before us is warm-blooded; or, when we know that A = B, and B = C, and conclude that A = C. In all such cases we are in the region of Realism. But in this article we are treating of Realism in philosophy, that is, in first or fundamental truth. It is of importance to announce the points which we assume, or, in other words,

The Positions of Realism. There are two which come first and come together: the knowledge of self and the knowledge of body.

1. The knowledge of self. This is a primary position. It is one maintained by nearly all idealists, who are so far realists. It is denied only by the extremest sceptics, who, however, always act upon it. It should be formulated as one of the first positions in philosophy.

2. The knowledge of something external, that is, of body as extended, and exercising power. Possibly this is the first cognitive act of the mind, being always accompanied by a consciousness of self, which knows the self as knowing the not-self.

Some have maintained that the knowledge of body is not a primitive act. There is said to be first an impression (a metaphorical and vague word) or sensation, and from this an inference that there is something external. This argument is not logical. We know the external thing as extended, and we cannot prove this from a mere impression or sensation, which has no extension. One who argues in this way may be called a realist, for he proceeds from a fact (illegitimately, I reckon) to a fact, but it is wiser to assume the existence of body as known to us immediately (see the argument infra, p. 330).

3. We know qualities of body and mind. We know these in knowing the things. This is commonly expressed by saying that we know things by their qualities; the proper statement is that we know things, mind and body, as having certain qualities. We know mind as perceiving, judging, resolving; we know body as having extension and resisting energy. These being realities, we can contemplate them, and we make affirmations and denials regarding them, and we can know more of them. He who affirms that Matter has not extension, as Berkeley does, is not a thorough realist. The same may be said of one, a materialist, who does not allow that we are conscious of mind as thinking and feeling.

4. We know space and time. These come in with, and are involved in, our knowledge of mind and body. Every one naturally looks upon them as realities, and cannot be made to think otherwise. They may not have an independent existence—we have no reason to think that they have—but they have a real existence. But, it is asked, What sort of nature and existence? I answer, What we naturally perceive them to have. Puzzling questions may be asked, but the difficulties cannot unsettle our natural convictions.

5. We know good and evil. According to the view I take, virtue

consists in "love according to law." Both of these are realities. Certainly, there is love in all morality, implying a living being. Law is also a reality, implying an agent under authority—some would say also a lawgiver, and reckon this the most satisfactory argument for the existence of God. This law implies obligation or oughtness, which is also a reality.

6. There are realities in relations. Some of these may be discovered intuitively, as in the very nature of the things. We first discover the reality of things, say mind and body, with their qualities, and then we discover the reality of the relation between things, say their identity in different circumstances, or their likeness, or the production of one by another. He who denies the reality of these, and makes them mere forms imposed on things by the mind, is so far a sceptic or agnostic, and is seeking to deliver himself from this by becoming an idealist.

7. There are other realities, about which there are disputes, and which it is not necessary to enumerate. For example, the mind has in the germ an idea of and belief in the Infinite, as was held by Anselm, Descartes, and Leibnitz; it cannot be made to believe that, however far out we go, there is an end of existence. A true realist believes in the existence of infinity. But I do not profess to mention here all our intuitions. The enumeration and defence of them would involve a full system of metaphysics.

Assuming these as the fundamental positions of Realism, there are few systems of philosophy which have really or avowedly followed them out. Indeed, scarcely any system has been pure Realism, thorough-going Idealism, or absolute Scepticism; most have been a heterogeneous mixture of some two, or the whole three, of these methods. Almost all have laid claim to some kind of reality. But some add to nature in order to make it more complete. Others abstract certain encumbrances, as they reckon them, to make it more rational. Most systems indulge in both the addition and abstraction. The additions of the idealist are attacked by the sceptic, who in doing so knocks down the whole fabric. The denials of the sceptic are met by unfounded statements on the part of the idealist, who thereby makes the building top-heavy, and ready to fall. The result is confusion and contradictions; not in things, but in our exposition of them. This must continue till it is laid down as a principle that the aim of all investigation in philosophy, as in science, is to discover facts, and nothing but facts.

The object of philosophy is to state and defend the reality of things. Believing them to be real, it is the object of the ordinary sciences, physical and mental, to discover their laws.

Though there are few pure systems of philosophic Realism, yet nearly all claim to have reality in them, and most of them have it, in part. It may serve some important purposes to go over the more distinguished systems, ancient and modern, and to ask what Realism each has, which, with me, means to inquire what truth there is in it. This is a difficult and hitherto an unattempted work—to pick the nuggets of gold out of the concrete earth in which they are embedded. No one man can accomplish it. He may begin it, but it will require a number of scholars and thinkers to carry it on toward completion. It is to be understood that my design is not to discard other philosophies, but to cull out of all of them what is true and good, and this not arbitrarily, but according to a principle, that of reality.

Meanwhile it may be interesting, after the manner of American interviewers, to ask each of our great philosophic thinkers what is his opinion as to the reality of things. I cherish the hope that even those who have no special taste for metaphysics may rather be pleased to have a brief interview with those who have ruled thought in ancient and modern times.

The Greek Philosophy. The Greeks, impelled by their clear and penetrating intellect, were ever seeking after reality, the τὸ ὄν and τὸ εἶναι. This was the grand aim of their philosophy. It was not the German search after the Absolute (which the German historians so often attribute to the Greeks); but it was for something nearer and closer. They perceived that all that appeared to the senses, all that presented itself to the mind, was not a reality. But they were sure that there was a reality, and they were bent on finding it; on finding essential being το ὄντως ὄν. So with them the fundamental distinction was not the modern one between a priori and a posteriori truth, but between the apparent and the real (τὸ φαινόμενον and τὸ ὄν).

With some the reality was merely in the senses, and they had no higher. Others put no faith in the senses as organs of truth, which they thought, however, could be discovered by the higher reason. The former are like the mountains which we have often seen in the Alps, with their base clear and their tops in the clouds; the latter are like those which have their base in mist and their summit in

sunshine. Realism seeks to have the mountain clear from base to top.

The Ionian physiologists sought after the origin of things which they found in elements. With the common people, they took things as they found them, and did not inquire specially into the nature of Being.

The Pythagorean or Italic school sought for a unity and harmony, and found it in numbers and forms which they considered to be as real as, or, rather, more real than, the things they combined. They had no special ethical system, but in conformity with their mathematical conceptions they made virtue a square number.

The Eleatics. It is a noteworthy circumstance that the search of the first metaphysical philosophers of Greece was for the nature of existence. "Only Being is, non-Being is not and cannot be thought." Being has not been created, has not been generated, cannot change, and can never cease. The mistake of the Eleatics consisted not in standing up resolutely for Being, but in saying too much about it. They sought for it down in great depths, whereas it lies patent on the surface. Instead of drawing water from the well by just plunging in the pitcher, they penetrated the bottom and stirred up mud. Existence is not a separate thing, like a stick or a stone. It is an abstraction from concrete realities, say of a stick and a stone. The error lay in hypostasizing an abstraction. There is no meaning in the saying that existence exists. The proper statement is that things exist. Of non-Being, of which they discoursed so much, no positive assertions can be made; it is simply nonsense to talk of it being a cause or condition of anything.

The Eleatics formally introduced into the Greek philosophy the doctrine that the senses make known not realities, but appearances, and are the sources of all error. They were right in holding that there is fixed Being, but wrong in arguing that it cannot change, and that there cannot be motion; change and motion are as palpable realities as the things.

Heracleitos was an offset from the Ionian school. According to him all things are in a perpetual flux, and the reality is a becoming—a truth which the Eleatics did not discover. He believed in a Zeus "who wills and wills not to be known."

Anaxagoras, a profound thinker, believed in all things being made of equal parts, and arranged by a divine *νοῦς*.

The Atomists, such as the Thracian Democritus and the Latin

Lucretius, held that the proper realities were atoms with a void between, by their motions producing all things. They were avowed materialists, and represented the soul as consisting in fine smooth and round atoms. They introduced an ideal theory, which, in one form or other, has been held ever since. The soul does not perceive things directly, but their images (εἴδωλα), which proceed from objects and are received by something cognate in our senses. In modern times the theory has assumed a more spiritual form in the philosophy of Descartes and Locke, and the images are supposed to be in the brain or mind. It has taken all the patient observation of Reid and the logical skill of Hamilton to expel this theory from philosophy and bring us to the very borders of Realism.

Hitherto the philosophers have had their seats in the various Greek colonies. From the middle of the fifth century B. C., philosophy centres in Athens, "the eye of Greece."

The Sophists were professional teachers, who instructed young men to act and speak. They had no faith in truth. They introduced the doctrine of Relativity, that truth is relative to the individual; that what is true to one man may not be true to another. Protagoras said that "man is the measure of all things, both of that which exists and of that which does not exist." This Relativity led, as it always does, to nescience, and Gorgias is reported as holding that "nothing exists, and if it exists it is unknowable, and granting that it were knowable it could not be communicated to others."

Plato sought to combine the perpetual flux of Heracleitos with the immutable Being of the Eleatics. He was surely right in holding by both doctrines. They do not need to be reconciled, for there is no discordance between them; the two joined constitute the truth.

He allowed to the Eleatics that the senses give us only appearances and not realities, and that they lead to errors and delusions. To counteract these he called in the higher reason, νοῦς or λόγος, which, being trained by mathematics and philosophic dialectics, gazes directly on the Idea which is in or before the Divine Mind. This Idea is the one grand reality, and other things, such as Matter, moral good, and beauty are real only so far as they partake of it. This is graphically represented in the myth of the cave, in which mankind are compared to chained prisoners, who see only the shadows of things on a wall before them, till, their chains being broken, they turn round and behold realities; so man naturally does

not know things, till by philosophic training he is enabled to behold them. Here we have a somewhat incongruous union of Idealism and Realism, which, following Plato, is a characteristic of nearly all later systems. It is Realism not assumed, but reached by a process, which, as not beginning with reality, can never logically reach it. So far as the senses are concerned, he is not a realist, but he is in regard to reason, which is the true organ of reality. He regards it as one of the functions of the reason to correct the deception of the senses. The proper statement is that the senses, internal and external, give us the real, and it is one of the offices of the reason to tell us precisely what the senses reveal, and for this purpose to distinguish between our original and acquired perceptions, and to reject fancies and erroneous inferences.

Mixed always with Idealism, which cannot be separated from it, we have a very elevated Realism in Plato. He believes in the reality of the true, the beautiful, and the good. The highest excellence of the mind consisted in the contemplation of moral good, which derives its excellence from its partaking of the Divine Idea.

The Alexandrian school took one side of Plato's philosophy and carried it to an extreme. They represented, as the highest excellence, intuition or ecstasy, which is the immediate gazing on the one and the good. It should be noticed that in all this they had not the living and true God, that is, a personal God, but simply an abstraction.

Aristotle is a thorough and consistent realist. There are scarcely any idealist or sceptical elements in his philosophy.

"By nature man is competently organized for truth, and truth in general is not beyond his reach."

He corrected the whole of the early philosophy of Greece by showing that the senses do not deceive, and that the supposed illusions arise from the wrong interpretation of the intimations they give, and inferences we draw from them. He drew an important distinction between common percepts, that is, common to all the senses—which are unity, number, size, figure, time, rest, and motion —and proper percepts, peculiar to one sense, such as color to the eye and odors to the smell. This turns out to be the same distinction, though seen under a somewhat different aspect, as that drawn in modern times between the primary and secondary qualities, used by Locke and Reid to defend the veracity of the senses. He has been quoted as holding the ideal theory of sense-perception when he says

that the senses give us "the form and not the matter," but Hamilton shows (Note M, to *Reid's Coll. Works*), that this statement is quite consistent with immediate perception.

While he held that the senses give us true knowledge, he affirms the same of other faculties, as, for instance, the memory, drawing an important distinction between simple memory (*μνῆσις*) and recollection (*ἀνάμνησις*), in which we hunt after a thought. He allots the highest function to the Reason (*νοῦς*), which takes two forms, the passive, which simply receives, and the active, which acts. His categories, ten in number, are a classification of what may be predicated about realities and their action.

He was called the Thinker of Plato's school, and I can conceive him as he sat for years under the teaching of his great master, indicating unmistakably his doubts of some of his positions, and justifying himself by the principle that much as he loved Plato he loved truth still more. He did not altogether set aside the ideal theory of Plato, but he corrected it by showing that the Idea was not reality above things, but in things, which is the true doctrine. He takes the right view of the discussion which has risen in modern times as to innate ideas. He designates Reason as "the repository of principles" (*τόπος εἰδῶν*), not in actuality but in capacity. He has a well-known division of cause—which he defines as "what makes a thing to be what it is"—into material, efficient, formal, and final, all of which have a reality and a deep meaning in every object in nature. His views of moral good are not so elevating as those of his master, but they are more definite. His definition of virtue, however, is somewhat complicated. "It is a deliberate habit (or tendency) in a mean relative to us, defined by right reason and as a wise man may declare;" where it should be observed he makes virtue to be an act of the will determined by right reason.

The Stoics were materialists, believing only in the existence of Matter. But they gave to Matter, especially to fiery Matter, of which the gods and the souls of men consisted, a power of thinking and moral perception. They had a *ἡγεμονικόν*, or ruling principle, which determined what was true and false, good and evil. Following Crates the Cynic, they represented virtue as the only good and made it consist in following nature, and vice as the only evil.

The Epicureans adopted the theory of Democritus as to images floating to the mind in order to perception. They had a canonicon, which guaranteed knowledge. It combined the knowledge given by

the senses, and was a kind of loose induction. They regarded pleasure as the only good, and sought to obtain freedom from care. It is justice to add that they gave the mind an anticipation (προλήψις) which revealed some higher truth, and the existence of the gods.

The Roman Philosophy. I do not dwell upon it. It has not much that is original. Lucretius has given a philosophy to the Epicureans. Cicero, an Academic, has given us interesting views of the ancient Greek sects, and defended truth as probable. M. Aurelius and Epictetus, the Stoics, give us a perception of moral good, and are our sternest heathen moralists.

The Mediæval Philosophy. Boethius gives the Stoic morality under a Christian aspect. The great body of the mediævalists had a strong logical tendency, and meant to follow Aristotle—which they did not always do, as they had not his writings in the original. Abelard's maxim was *intellige ut credas;* Anselm's, *crede ut intelligas.* They held that we reach realities, human and divine, both by intelligence and faith, the former primarily by intelligence, the latter by faith. In the midst of them was a body of Mystics, such as Eckhart and Tauler, sprung from the pseudo-Dyonysius and John Scot Erigena, who were Mystic idealists.

Bacon was the freshest thinker of his age, and has had the largest and happiest influence. But he was not specially a metaphysician. Wise man as he was, he took things as he found them, and has shown how we may rise from particular things to minor, middle, and major axioms, and finally to causes and forms. He adopts Aristotle's fourfold division of causes, which were all reckoned by him as real, final cause testifying in behalf of God. The highest aim of science is to discover formal cause, which is next unto God, and makes a thing to be what it is; thus he found motion to be the form of heat, and was ridiculed for ages for saying so. I claim Bacon as favoring the philosophy of Realism. He begins with it, proceeds with it throughout, and ends with it. But he has nowhere expounded it.

Descartes may be claimed as a realist, though I am not sure that he carried out the system consistently. He starts with "I think," which he assumes. This implies the ego, "*cogito, ergo sum.*" I think his assumption should have been *ego cogitans*, as a fact of consciousness. From this he derives other truths by what he regards as a rigidly logical process. In the ego there is the idea of the Infinite, the Perfect, which implies the existence of a corresponding object, that is, God. We have all an idea of extension, and the Divine

Veracity guarantees the existence of an extended body. It may be doubted whether all the reasoning is valid, but he believed it to be so, and he proceeds from realities to realities. He draws a high ethics from the perfect character of God. It would have been wiser in Descartes to assume, as Reid and Hamilton did, the existence of Matter, instead of seeking to prove it by what is not clearer than what he proves. Descartes has made French philosophy and French thinking generally clear and realistic. It can be shown that Descartes held the ideal theory of sense-perception, that is, that we perceive external objects by ideas in the brain or in the mind.

Malebranche, called the Christian Plato, did not trust sensation or sentiment, but made ideas discover truth. He believed in Matter on the ground of Scripture (being a Catholic, he believed in the Real Presence in the sacrament), when his philosophic principles might have led him into Idealism.

Spinoza has been much lauded for several ages past by those who favor Pantheism and follow the higher German philosophy, on which he has exercised a powerful influence. His method is the mathematical one of Descartes, what I call the joint dogmatic and deductive, a method not applicable to philosophy. He starts with definitions which are ill-defined and with axioms which are arbitrary. We are not sure whether his deductions are logical or mere logomachies. Like Descartes, whom he so far followed, he had realities both in extension and thinking. But, unlike Descartes, who so widely separated the two, he identifies them in one substance which he calls God, of whom all existing things, including moral evil, are modes.

Hobbes is certainly a superlatively clear thinker and writer. What he sees he sees clearly and expresses it dogmatically. There are persons who are sure that one who asserts so unhesitatingly must be speaking truly. He is not a comprehensive thinker. He overlooks the most obvious facts, as patent and as important as those he notices. He believes in the bodily senses, but does not give them an immediate perception, and he dwells upon extension and motion. But he has no place in his philosophy for self-consciousness, when it gives us an immediate knowledge of self as thinking and feeling.

Locke, a man of profound sense and great sagacity, meant to be a realist. But, following a wrong philosophic principle, he became theoretically an idealist. He declares that the mind is percipient only of its ideas. If this be so, it is difficult to see how it could ever

come to know any external object. Idea is defined as "the object of the understanding when it thinks." The true account is that it is the thing without the mind or within the mind which is the object of the understanding, and it is the contemplation of this thing which constitutes the idea.

He reconciled himself to his doctrine by regarding the ideas as representing things. But if the mind did and could not perceive the things, there is no means of proving that there are things, or that they correspond to the ideas. So, while Locke was a realist in his personal convictions, in his philosophy he was an idealist.

In following out his theory he had to define knowledge, not, as is commonly done, as the agreement of our ideas with things, but as the perception of the agreement or repugnance of our ideas with one another. His theory thus shut him up into his own mind, and allowed him no outlet logically. He would have been entitled to assume that the mind perceives things, but he had no proof that the ideas were representative of things.

On one very important point (this has seldom been noticed) Locke was a realist avowedly and truly. He held that the mind did not perceive things, but ideas; but that, having ideas which are representations of things, we can compare them; and when we do so immediately this is intuition. He should have brought in intuition at an earlier stage, and given the mind a direct intuition of things external and internal (he should have given to sensation and reflection an intuition of things). But I rejoice to find him bringing in intuition, even at this late stage. It gives him demonstration in which all the steps are seen to be true intuitively. On the supposition that ideas represent things, he is entitled to maintain that the mind perceives the agreement or disagreement of things through ideas.

It is to be lamented that Locke, bent on carrying out his theory that the mind has only two inlets of knowledge, sensation and reflection, does not allow it a power of moral perception—it was left to Shaftesbury and Hutcheson to supply this. According to him, the idea of moral good and evil is given by sensation, with God called in to reward the good and punish the evil.

Berkeley is the representative idealist of the English philosophy. He carried out the idealism of Locke to its logical consequences. If the mind can never perceive anything but ideas, there is no evidence of there being anything else; and if there were, it could never be

known, and could serve no purpose. There is a sense in which Berkeley is a realist, and a determined realist: he believes in the reality of ideas created and sustained by the Divine Being, and in this way (not very wisely, I think) he opposed materialism and irreligion. Ideas served the same end in philosophy as things do in the vulgar belief, and there is no need of calling in atoms and molecules and extensions, with their materialistic tendencies and their contradictions. Berkeley's philosophy is made attractive by his representing sensible things as a system of signs of divine truths. This may be as true as it is beautiful, but it can become so only by holding that sensible things are real.

Leibnitz. Looking to his mathematics as well as his metaphysics, Leibnitz has always appeared to me to be the greatest genius among the German philosophers. He has this great merit, that he thinks and writes clearly. The defect of many of his speculations, particularly his monadical theory, is that they cannot be proved nor disproved. He has one reality in monads, which have an essential existence and inherent power, but do not act on each other.

Shaftesbury corrected Locke's narrow views of the inlets of knowledge by calling in, besides the two upheld by Locke, namely, sensation and reflection, a sense of beauty, a sense of honor, etc., and especially a moral sense which perceived moral good.

Butler, in his treatise on Identity, stands up for the existence and identity of the soul, and in his sermons for a conscience which looks at the good, and has authority over all the other powers of the mind.

Hutcheson is the founder of the Scottish school. He adheres to the ideal theory of sense-perception; otherwise he is a realist. He believes in a moral sense, a sense of beauty, and other senses, much the same as Shaftesbury. His moral system is defective in that it makes virtue consist in benevolence, overlooking law and justice.

Hume wished it to be understood that as a man he believed and acted very much as other people do. But as a philosophic thinker he took up the positions held by the reputed philosophers of his day, especially Descartes, Locke, and Berkeley, and inquired what was their foundation, and the conclusions to which they logically led; and in doing so, found that there were left no real things, but only impressions, without a thing impressed or a thing to impress, and ideas, which are fainter impressions. Ever since, philosophy has been laboring to build up the breach which has been made by the assaults of the great sceptic. Starting with impressions and their fainter reproductions,

he could never reach things. Under memory he could get only an identity imposed by the mind. Belief is only an impression of a lively kind, accompanying an idea. He gives mind a capacity of discovering a number of relations. Four of these, resemblance, contrariety, degree, proportion, do not seem to carry us beyond the present impression. Three others, identity, space and time, cause and effect, seem to do so, but do not. He labors to show as to cause and effect that there is nothing in it but invariable antecedence and consequence. The belief in it is the effect of habit and the association of ideas.

In moral good there is only a tendency to promote happiness. There is no valid evidence of any interference with the orderly succession of nature by miracles, which are violations of the laws of nature. The aim of Hume in all this is to undermine the evidence which we have for the existence of things. He is to be met successfully only by a thorough-going Realism, showing that we are justified in assuming the existence of things.

Reid was the first worthy opponent of Hume. He was distinguished by good sense and patient observation. He was a realist in practical belief, and meant to be so in philosophy. He succeeded partially. Hume may be met at two points, as he enters and as he proceeds. Reid met him at both. He saw the danger of allowing the Trojan horse to enter the city. He shows that in perception by the senses we come to know the primary qualities of bodies. I am not sure that his account of the perceptive act is thoroughly correct. He brings in, first, sensation, and then perception; the sensation suggesting (an unfortunate phrase, taken from Locke and Berkeley) the perception. He argues resolutely that the process is instinctive, and is perceived by reason in the first degree, or common sense. But there does not seem to be any proof that the sensation comes before the perception, or that the former suggests the latter; they seem to come together. The doctrine of natural Realism is that the mind comes to know at once the extended object beyond the body or within the body—how far in we may not be able to determine. Reid does not dwell at such length as we might expect on self-consciousness and the knowledge of self imparted by it; but he represents it as revealing to us mind, with its qualities. He meets Hume at all his farther stages. There is memory, which brings up past events as real. Reason has two degrees; reason in the first degree, which is common sense; which looks on truth at once, on con-

tingent truth and on necessary truth, such as causation, which reveals power in the cause; reason in the second degree, or reasoning, reaches farther truth by inference. He stands up for a moral power which discerns moral good. All these are realities; we know them by cognitive powers.

Kant is the second great opponent of Hume that appeared. He is not so careful an observer as Reid, but he is a more powerful logician. His philosophy certainly does not start with Realism. He makes the mind begin with phenomena in the sense of appearances, and not with things. In this respect he yielded too much to his opponent, starting, in fact, with the sceptical conclusion which Hume reached. He tried therefrom to reach realities, and believed in the reality of things, but it is generally acknowledged that he utterly failed. No one can legitimately argue real things from phenomena any more than he can from impressions and ideas. Secondly, he supposes that the mind, out of its own stores, superadds forms to the phenomena which it knows: such as space and time to sense; categories such as that of cause and effect, twelve in all, to the understanding; and ideas such as those of substance, conditions, and God to the ideas of the pure reason, the last of these being entirely subjective. In all this he was an idealist, and prepared the way for Fichte, the absolute idealist.

Kant is thus at one and the same time an agnostic and idealist, and is claimed so far legitimately by the supporters of both systems. He is an agnostic in that he does not allow that the mind perceives things. He is an idealist inasmuch as he is ever clothing phenomena with a subjective covering. Ever since his day, philosophy has been swinging between transcendentalism and agnosticism; between the transcendentalism of Hegel and the agnosticism which has culminated in Herbert Spencer.

To counteract the unbelief of the speculative reason, Kant called in the moral or practical reason, whose law was the categorical imperative which necessitates a belief in responsibility, in a judgment-day, and in God—all of which, as I understand, are regarded by Kant as realities. But it has been seen that, after having made so many concessions to Hume at the starting, he is not in a favorable position when he would meet Hume by establishing higher truths. He is right in giving a cognitive power to the moral reason, but he should have given a like power to the understanding, and this would have made his system stable and consistent.

Dugald Stewart was the most eminent disciple of Reid, and a judicious defender of the Scottish school. His philosophy reads as if it were thoroughly realistic, yet it is scarcely so. His doctrine is that we do not know things, but the qualities of things. But can we, from mere qualities, argue the existence of things? The proper statement is that we know the thing, with its qualities. We do not know extension apart from body; we know body as extended. Stewart stood up for the reality of moral qualities and man's perception of them.

Thomas Brown sought to unite the French school of his day with the Scottish, in which he had been trained. He was a realist, in that he believed in an external world. But he got it by inference, and thus belongs to what I call the Inferential School. There are first sensations in the mind, but these are not produced by anything in the mind. However, they must have a cause, and this cause must be external, that is, Matter. I am not sure of the validity of this argument. It can be used only by those who, with Brown, hold by an intuitive conviction as to causation. Without this it would be difficult for the infant mind to argue from these sensations, springing up apparently so capriciously, that they had a cause. But there is a stronger argument against a knowledge of Matter being obtained from a sensation. We always apprehend body as extended, but we can never, from a sensation which is not extended, argue the existence of body, which is extended. He held that the virtues were a class of emotions, and thus set aside that perception which we have of good and evil.

Coleridge studied the German philosophy of his day, but did not very clearly understand it. He sought to introduce the distinction between the understanding and the reason, but it cannot be carried out consecutively. There is an intuitive reason, but it is found in the senses and the understanding, discovering realities and relations among them. His grand views of reason had an elevating influence in Great Britain and in America, as opposed to sensationalism.

Sir William Hamilton, as became a knight, was a powerful champion of what he believed to be truth. He is professedly the most determined of all realists. He has defended the doctrine more clearly than any other. He shows that consciousness testifies in behalf of the immediate knowledge both of mind and body. But unfortunately, as I think, he sought to unite the German philosophy of his day with the Scottish, and was unable to make the two amal-

gamate. The two philosophies have much in common; both hold by native and necessary truth; but the former reaches it by criticism, the latter by a careful observation of what passes in the mind.

Hamilton maintained resolutely that the mind perceives Matter directly, but that this knowledge is only relative. He maintains that we are not to suppose that we know things as they are; we add elements of our own to them. "Suppose that the total object of consciousness in perception = 12, and suppose that the external reality contributes 6, the material sense 3, and the mind 3; this may enable you to form some rude conjecture of the nature of perception." Instead of being the great realist, as he promised to be, he has become the great relativist, and has supplied the nescient doctrine from which Herbert Spencer starts. That doctrine must be set aside if Spencer is to be answered. Following Hobbes and Locke, he has made our idea of infinity negative. There is surely something more, whether we are able to express it or not, in our belief in infinity. He is constantly calling in faith to save us from the nescience of the understanding, but has nowhere explained what is the nature and province of faith. He does not treat specially of morals, but he regards the moral argument as the available one for the existence of God.

John S. Mill was led by his father, James Mill, to adopt many of the principles of Hume, and, in consequence could never reach reality. His philosophy, in its ultimate issues, is scarcely an advance on Hume. His definition of Matter is "the permanent possibility of sensations;" of Mind, "a series of feelings aware of itself." The one of these sets aside the testimony of the senses, the other of the consciousness and memory, all of which reveal realities. The fame of Mr. Mill as a philosopher must rest not on his metaphysics, in which he only carries out Hume's principles, but on his logic of induction, in which he has given a completeness to the logic of Bacon.

The A Priori Philosophy of Germany. We have seen that Kant introduced a powerful ideal element into philosophy in his forms of sense, understanding, and reason, under which the mind views all phenomena. Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel seized one after the other on this element, and have constructed huge systems by keen dialectic processes. They were men of powerful speculative ability, acquainted with all the forms of logic, and have reared imposing structures with a symmetry which we are constrained to admire. They have elements of truth in their theories (every imagination is

formed of actualities), but the whole is as fictitious as the clouds of the sky, often so massive and apparently solid.

Fichte is the representative idealist of modern times. He had for a time been a pupil of Kant, who in the end disowned him, because he carried out the principles of his master to consequences which the master did not contemplate. Kant made space and time, our deeper judgments and higher ideas, subjective, vainly arguing all the while that there were things. Fichte made the things subjective as well as the forms in which they are clothed; all are projections of the mind, which posits them according to laws of development which he can unfold out of his own mind or brain. If the mind can create time and space, as Kant holds, why not all else, including God? He had an ego and a self-consciousness, which he made universal. This ego posits the non-ego, and is the absolute reality. There is nothing corresponding to this in my consciousness nor in any other body's. He guaranteed it by a kind of faith which is not explained. Speculation could not remain at the place where Fichte left it.

Schelling sought to supply an evident defect in the philosophy of Fichte. Fichte made all subjective. Schelling placed the objective alongside of it. He had an ego, and also a non-ego, but he made both subjective and the two identical. Hence his philosophy is called that of identity. All this is supposed to be perceived and guaranteed by an intellectual intuition to which there is nothing corresponding in human consciousness. It has been subjected to a terrible criticism by Hamilton. To me there is an essential difference between things, say between pleasure and pain, moral good and evil.

Hegel. I am not competent to enter into a wrestling match with this gigantic dialectician. When I have ventured on rare occasions to criticise him, I have been told that I do not understand him, and probably this is true. There is a story told of his saying, "Only one man understands me, and he does not." It is not proven that Hegel ever actually said this, but he might have said it, and the story has been invented by one who knew what Hegel's philosophy was. On several occasions I have made an earnest endeavor to understand him. I am certainly not the individual who understands him, and yet I so far understand him. I understand that his method is not the inductive, which observes what takes place in the mind. It proceeds upon the idealistic element in Kant's philosophy, as carried out by Fichte and Schelling, but subjects it to a process which is declared to be rational and logical. But my reason is not prepared

to sanction the processes which he elaborates. His logic is certainly not that of Aristotle, who gives us, I believe, a correct analysis of the discursive processes of the mind. He and his followers have drawn out innumerable triplet divisions on all subjects—which they identify with the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity—by seizing on a quality, putting in one class all objects that have it, in another class all which do not have it, and in a third class what is indifferent; all this without inquiring whether there are such divisions in nature. He finds perpetual contradictions where I can find none, but simply, it may be, mysteries; but where there are real contradictions I am sure that they cannot both be true, as Hegel maintains; the truth of the one implies the falsehood of the other. As seeking to embrace all in his comprehensive system, he holds that it is realistic as well as idealistic, and claims to have reached a Realism not found in Kant. But his Realism does not consist in bodies or in self, as perceived by the senses external and internal, but simply in the dialectic process constructed by his own powerful understanding.

Herbert Spencer is possessed of a comprehensive, speculative intellect, like Hegel, the difference being that the one deals with the development of nature, the other with the development of thought. The one is the representative of the agnostics, as the other is of the idealists, of our day. According to Spencer, we do not know the nature or reality of the things within or around us. But by a necessity of thought we are constrained to believe in the reality of a thing beyond the sensible world, this thing is unknown and unknowable. But surely I know that I exist, and so much of my nature and of the things around me. I am not sure of the validity of the argument by which he proves that there is this unknown thing. I do not feel as if I had an intuition to this effect. I believe that I have an intuition or intuitions which carry me beyond sensible things, but Mr. Spencer has not interpreted them rightly. I am sure that from these existing things which I know, the self and the related objects, I can legitimately argue other things as their causes, and in particular that there must be a Cause of the order and purpose I discover in the universe, and that this Cause is known so far from its effects to be intelligent and benevolent—all of which are real.

It turns out that this unknown and unknowable reality is so far known by Mr. Spencer. He knows it as a force, a power, or cause, and as without limit. "The belief in a power of which no limit in time or space can be conceived is that fundamental element in re-

ligion which survives all changes of form." All this seems to me to point clearly and explicitly to a God, unknown in his total being, but so far known and having a relation to us. But the Real known to Mr. Spencer is very scanty. It is, first, the unknown thing necessitated by thought, and, secondly, the development of the things which he represents as unknown, but which I regard as known.

Lotze, in his metaphysics, is so far a reaction against the Idealism of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. I am happy to find that his search is the old Greek one for the Real. I am not sure that he always finds it and expresses it correctly. He seems to me sometimes to add to it, and it becomes ideal; at other times to take from it, when it becomes so far sceptical. He is liable to the same charge as I have brought against the Eleatics; he says too much about such simple objects as existence, Being, and Real. All that philosophy can do is to discover and express what intuition reveals as to things. When it goes beyond this it is apt to make assertions which have no meaning, or which cannot be proven, or, we may add, disproven, or which cannot be proven except by induction.

He makes space and time subjective, with no objective existence, on somewhat different grounds from Kant, but leading to the same issues. He certainly proves that we are not obliged to give them an independent existence, but surely they have some kind of existence, according to our intuitive perception.

He believes in body and in soul. He acknowledges the reality of force, and has important remarks as to its nature, but raises questions which can be settled only by induction. He believes in self-judging conscience. It is an encouraging circumstance to find the German philosophy seeking the Real instead of constructing ideal systems.

I am deeply sensible of the imperfections of this account of the various philosophies. Enough has been advanced to show that there is an avowed or latent Realism running through nearly all of them. But in the majority of cases it is in a raw and undigested form, with excrescences on the one hand and deficiencies on the other. What is needed is to cut off the one and supply the other. When this is done we shall have a discriminate Realism.

In order to do this certain distinctions have to be drawn. I have stated them elsewhere,* but they need to be kept steadily before the

---

* *Psychology, the Cognitive Powers*, pp. 27–30.

view in all philosophic inquiry. There is the distinction between our sensations, which are organic feelings, and our perceptions, which are cognitions. We should stand up for the knowledge given in perception, but are not bound to hold to the objective reality of the feelings. Special importance should be attached to the distinction between our original and acquired perceptions. The former are trustworthy, having the sanction of our constitution and the God who gave it to us; but our inferences from these and our added associations may be erroneous and misleading. Thirdly, there is the well-known distinction (often improperly stated) between the primary and secondary qualities of Matter. We know Matter as extended directly; we know heat, which is molecular motion, merely as the cause of the sensations in our nerves. For our present purpose there is a more important distinction. It is that between the realities given by sense and those discerned by a higher power, such as moral qualities. Both are real, but they are different things. Drawing such distinctions, we are able to cast aside mere appearances and irrelevances, and keep firm hold of a Realism or knowledge of things which may be implicitly trusted.

I do not expect that this, our method of philosophy, will meet with an immediate approval. On the one hand, it will be opposed (when it is not ignored) by the prevailing ideal schools of Germany which have ramified from Kant. On the other hand, it will be resisted by all who have come within the grasp of Herbert Spencer.*

American and, I may add, British students, who have a taste for metaphysical speculation, after taking a degree in their own country, commonly go for a year or two to a German university. The philosophy which they had been taught at home had more or less in it of the Realism of the British schools. In Germany they are involved, without introduction, in the forms and distinctions of Kant and then to the dialectics of Hegel, all with an idealistic tendency, and they soon find themselves in a labyrinth without a clew to guide them out. Some of them remain for a time in Germany, caught in the toils of the profound systems, and then return to their own country to expound them in formidable language to students who wonder and admire, but are not sure whether the tenets taught are as true as they are sublime. Others return sooner, with an incongruous

* A friend told us impiously that we are certain to be crucified between two malefactors, to which our reply was, that the two extremes would die and never be heard of again, while the power between would rise again with greater influence.

mixture of Realism and Idealism, which, though they do not see it, will not amalgamate, and it is ludicrous to observe in their writings and lectures one paragraph British and American, marked by good sense, and the next Kantian criticism, and the third Hegelian dialectic, without their discovering the inconsistency. It is clear to me that such modes of philosophy will not lead and guide so shrewd and practical a people as the Americans.

But it is asked, Are we unmercifully to cut off every form of Idealism? It is urged that we may commit the same mistakes in philosophy as a modern realistic school in art does when it exhibits objects so bare and haggard—skull and bones, wounds and sores—as to make them unattractive, at times horrid. Some feel that if we proceed in this way we are abnegating all that is interesting in speculation. Upon this I have to remark that under Realism the speculative intellect is allowed to discuss all manner of subjects, but its first and its final aim should be out of these to construct a philosophy. When it has done so, it may wander as widely as its feet can carry it, and mount as high as the air will bear it up; but let it know and acknowledge, all the while, the difference between air and earth, and ever be prepared to settle on *terra firma*. It will be proper to continue the discussion as to the atomic and monadic theories, as to a priori and a posteriori ideas, the relative and the absolute, and a hundred other topics, but it has now a test by which to try all hypotheses—Do they agree with facts? The vessel may sail over a wide ocean, but it should always start from land and seek land; go out from a harbor and keep it in view to reach a haven.

Realism may be defended on several grounds, not independent of each other, but conspiring to one end.

1. It is what we spontaneously accept. We are sure we know realities; we seek for them, we cling to them, we follow them, we are not satisfied with anything less, or, indeed, with anything else. Without this we feel that there is something wanting; with this we feel satisfied so far as the object is concerned.

2. Everything falls in with it and confirms it. We start with it as a natural assumption, but we find it corroborated by all that is occurring. We remember a hill of a marked shape on which our eye rested in our childhood, and we are sure that there was such a hill. After being years away we go back to the same place and find the same hill. This may be taken as an example of the corroborations which the realist is ever meeting with.

3. Realism as an hypothesis explains every phenomenon more satisfactorily than any other system. This is a mode of testing the truth of a theory often resorted to in the present day. In the first instance, we accept the opinion advanced simply as an hypothesis, and then inquire if it can explain the facts. I believe that Realism, as a theory, can explain the facts more satisfactorily than Scepticism or Idealism. Scepticism, total or partial, will ever be confronted with facts which it cannot but believe. Idealism will ever feel itself floating insecurely in the air, as long as it has not a pillar in facts to which to attach itself. The foundation of Realism is fact, facts are its superstructure, and its copestone is a fact, and thus it stands firm while other systems totter and fall. There may be problems which it cannot solve, mysteries which it cannot clear up; it will leave them in that state for the present, and wait patiently till they are elucidated, which must always be done by other facts.

In this final philosophy all that is established in the previous philosophies will be embraced. But this will not be in the usual eclectic way, by a mere agglomeration of systems. It is not the crude Realism of the first thinkers. It has attended to Bacon's counsel and made "the necessary rejections and exclusions." It believes that there is gold, but not that all that glitters is gold. It finds the true gold by casting out the dross. This test is the magnet which, leaving out everything else, will attract and collect the true metal. The product will be consistent because of the consistency of truth.

The philosophy expounded in this article is eclectic, but merely in that it accepts the reality from all systems. It is Greek, in that it seeks after things in their true nature. It is Scottish, in that it proceeds by induction and by it discovers fundamental truth. It is German, in that it stands up for a priori truth, but does not seek it, like Kant or Hegel, by the critical or dialectic method. It is French, in that it is a judicious reduction of other systems. Sooner or later —the sooner the better—we must fall back upon, or, rather, advance forward to, this method. I confess that I wish that America, which has no special philosophy, should favor and fashion it, and make it its own. It is altogether in the way of what it has done in a scattered manner in the past, and should now do in a systematic method.

 JAMES MCCOSH.

THE RESURRECTION OF BURIED LANGUAGES.

"AND when he saw the Bosphorus," writes the genial old story-teller of Halicarnassus, concerning the greatest of the Persian rulers, "he set up by it two columns of white stone, and engraved thereon characters—on one Assyrian and on the other Greek—the names of all the peoples he had in his army." "Now these columns," he goes on to say, "the Byzantines brought into the city, after these events, and used them at the altar of the Orthosian Artemis, except one stone; this was left near the Temple of Dionysus, in Byzantium, covered with Assyrian characters" (iv., 87). Who knows what became of these stones? They lie beneath the dust of Constantine's city, perhaps, with their shapely, clean-cut wedges and curves packed in soft earth, and guarded for the ages; but if they long ago crumbled into lime, and hold Moslem houses together, it may be that Greek epigraphy has lost as much as Persian or Assyrian has, for the cuneiform decipherers have learned, without their aid, most of what they could have told. We cannot doubt that the "Assyrian characters" written of by Herodotus were the same *cuneoli* that for centuries, at Persepolis and Behistun, suffered the abuse of the elements and waited patiently for some man to notice them.

They had to wait a long time. The Persian greatness, heir of the glory of Nebuchadnezzar and Ashurbanipal, passed down, and dwindled from king to kinglet, till Alexander came, and the "Greek characters" proved too strong for the "Assyrian." Alexander drank too much wine one day, and burned Persepolis—Behistun most likely he never saw, and those who came after him cared still less than he did for the self-glorifications of the Achæmenidæ. Seleucus and his descendants did not try to amalgamate the East and the West. The Parthians came down as wild plunderers, and when they were tamed they turned merchants rather than scholars. To the Roman literati the Orientals were barbarians, and with more reason, it must be allowed, than the Greeks had had to call them so, when the Babylonian priests were poets and astronomers and historians, and kings were gathering great libraries along the Mesopo-

tamian rivers. And, as if to crush down and hide utterly and hopelessly all traces of the older civilization, Mohammedanism and the Turk marched over the ground where it used to stand, and stamped out the living remembrance of it from the earth. It was reserved for men from lands which Darius might have thought beyond the confines of the world—men of strange tongue and strange religion —to walk back along the path by which history had come, stepping cautiously from one well-worn guide-post to another, until, after many wanderings and a long *détour*, they came into the midst of ancient peoples and a full, stirring life of which they had scarcely dreamed.

But the impulse to discovery and decipherment did not come through the classics. Neither Herodotus' account of the columns of Darius, nor Thucydides' mention of the letter in "Assyrian characters," addressed by Artaxerxes to the Lacedæmonians, and captured by Aristides of Athens, nor Strabo's more accurate distinction between "the Assyrian and the Persian characters"—both of which Ctesias, the Greek physician, knew—nor Arrian's account of the Assyrian writing on the monument of Sardanapalus and the Persian writing on the tomb of Cyrus—none of these, nor any ancient tradition wandering into Western lands along some by-way of literature, or in some legend of the Orient passing from mouth to mouth, gave the occasion to European scholars to busy themselves with the language and the writing of the ancient lords of Babylon and Nineveh, and those of their conquerors out of the Persian mountains. If the East called to the West to come and learn its secret, it was with no articulate voice.

When Europe began to wake up, three or four hundred years ago, religion and trade brought each its devotees from beyond the Mediterranean into Persia. Reports of the splendid ruins of Persepolis, glowing and inexact, came back as one and another returned to the Western home. It was not until the seventeenth century had opened, however, that the inscriptions borne by door-post and slab attracted close attention, and since these were of no consequence to either the missionary or the merchant, it was not they who introduced them to European scholars. A Spanish diplomat, Garcias de Sylva de Figuëroa, sent as ambassador to Goa by Philip III., made it in his way to visit the remains of Persepolis, and satisfy the curiosity and love of knowledge which had been turned in the direction of that ancient capital by the stories of a Spanish monk. In

1618 he was on the ground, and was the first not only to put on record any description of the ruins that even approached sober accuracy, but also to give an account of the strange characters that covered them. These characters he observed with some precision, concluded them to be the representation of words in letters, and thought he could distinguish the difference in age of different groups.

The interest excited by the observations of Figuëroa was increased, and given a still more definite object, by the letters of a Roman gentleman, Pietro della Valle, who travelled for the love of it, and visited Persepolis in 1621. These letters, first published in Italian, were soon translated into French, Dutch, and German. They owed their popularity in part to their lively and entertaining style, not unmixed with naïveté (as when he says of the Jordan pilgrims: "I saw, with great amusement, how some drank of this river, others swam in it, one washed his dishes and his shirts"; or, after a minute description of the punishment of criminals in Persia by hanging them up by the feet, writes: "If the evil-doer is to remain alive . . . they let him hang only an hour or two, and then loosen him, which does not harm his life; but while he is hanging he must have great patience"), but largely also to the novelty and variety of their contents, for their author journeyed into "Turkey, Egypt, Palestine, Persia, East India, and other far distant regions," and if the plate on the titlepage of one edition of his book, representing a pilgrim, with wind-blown garments, stepping gayly from peak to peak of impossible mountains, is perhaps calculated to awaken suspicion as to the veracity of the contents, the cuneiform decipherer has no reason to charge the author with any serious deviation from the way of truth.

Della Valle advanced the knowledge of the wedge-characters in two respects. He copied five of them, which were published in his book, and he expressed an opinion in regard to the direction in which they were written. He concluded, and he was entirely right —although "I do not affirm this as a certainty," he cautiously added—that the characters were formed from left to right. The reason is noteworthy. He observed that the broad end of the wedge was at the top, when the wedge was vertical, and at the left, when it was horizontal. Hence, assuming that the vertical wedges were made from the top downward, he inferred that the broad end was the beginning of the wedge, that the horizontal wedges were made from left to right, and that the inscription was written in that

direction. "But if any one should say," he continues, "that the thin and not the broad end is the head and beginning of the stroke, and hence the contrary direction is to be inferred, I will answer then, that in that case [in the upright letters] the point must stand not beneath but above, which is not the case; because, in all letters, of whatever sort they are, their head and beginning is always at the top and not at the bottom."

Figuëroa and Della Valle had given the curious traveller to the East a definite goal and purpose, and from one land and another he wandered Persia-ward. Those whose affairs led them that way imitated the Spanish ambassador, and dipped into archæology. There was no rush of explorers, nor any systematic and authoritative attempt to collect all the facts. Yet as, at intervals, this man or that reached Persian ground, he added a little to the stock of materials for study and for theory-building which his predecessors had gathered. Flower came there from England, and copied a few more signs than Della Valle had noted down. Chardin went out from France, and brought back a whole inscription in copy. Kaempfer, from Germany, reproduced several. But the time was not ripe for decipherment. Knowledge concerning the languages of the East was not sufficient to assure any inquiring scholar what sort of tongue he might expect to find if once he could penetrate the mysterious garb in which these ancient records were clothed, nor did a comparison of the materials furnished by different travellers remove question as to the correctness of their observation and the exactness of their copies. Even the fine plates published by Cornelis de Bruin, who went out from Holland, and visited Persepolis in 1704, though adding much to the stock of information already at hand, did not furnish thoroughly accurate copies of the inscriptions. At the same time the fact that he had done so much, and published so sumptuously the results of his journey, deterred others from attempting anything beyond his achievements. No progress was made for fifty years after him. A vase from Egypt, with a wedge-inscription by the side of hieroglyphs, found its way to France, but it does not appear that any one connected it, in the way of serious and thorough investigation, with the inscriptions of Persepolis, although Count Caylus published an account of the vase in 1762. Far from announcing definite progress, the loudest and most emphatic voice that uttered an opinion on the subject, during the earlier and middle part of the eighteenth century, denied with

the utmost dogmatism that progress could be made. This voice came from an English wiseacre, Thomas Hyde, a man of considerable learning, but without either the breadth or the depth that mark the great scholar, and apparently too well satisfied with his own views to care to run the risk of having to alter them by exposing them to the test of facts. It is a little singular now to read the *ex cathedrâ* declarations, the would-be finalities, of this self-important man, setting forth how the wedge-shaped characters are neither letters nor hieroglyphs nor figure-words, but a mere engraver's sport, aiming to see how many different forms could be made out of one single element, the wedge. This theory seemed to its unfortunate author to require that no combination of wedges should appear more than once on the walls of Persepolis; accordingly, he was venturesome enough to affirm that this was the case. He went so far as to find the engravers of these curious ornaments among travellers, wishing to leave their mark by the way, and abused these "travellers" roundly for the annoying and insoluble, because unreal, problems which they had thrust upon the world of scholars in their reckless and unmeaning self-commemoration.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century the condition of things grew more favorable. The chief agent in bringing about this change came from still another land, Denmark, and if his son gained a wider reputation, because he devoted himself to the better-known classic literature and re-wrote the history of Rome, the father was none the less a scientific man of great attainments and sound methods. It was Carsten Niebuhr who furnished those who tried their hand at decipherment with the data they needed to begin with. Niebuhr went out as member of an Oriental party of explorers sent by the King of Denmark. The expedition was in some respects an ill-starred one. Of the five members, Niebuhr alone lived to return. He was not an epigraphist nor a philologian, but a geographer, yet the quickness and sureness of eye which he possessed stood him in good stead when it seemed necessary for him to make up, as far as possible, for the loss of his comrades who had fallen by the way. He copied, in 1765, many inscriptions, and copied them well, so that his book remained for years a *Corpus Inscriptionum Persicarum*. But beyond this—partly, indeed, in consequence of this close attention to the inscriptions—his trained vision clearly perceived two important facts. One was that when the same inscription was repeated, the character which stood at the right-hand end of a line in one case appeared at

the left-hand end of the next line in another. He decided forthwith, as Della Valle had done, but on different grounds, and more positively than Della Valle, that the writing proceeded from left to right. Besides this he detected important differences in the kind of character, *i. e.*, in the number and grouping of the wedges, in different inscriptions, and was able to point out, on this basis, three distinct styles of inscription, appearing side by side, but not confounded with one another, and obviously unlike in respect to the degree of complexity found in them. It was the simplest of these three kinds from which Della Valle had taken his five characters, and to this simplest kind, as the most likely to yield results, the first intelligent attempts of decipherers were now devoted; Niebuhr himself counted forty-two different signs in these simplest inscriptions, and called them "letters of the oldest Persian writing." The volume of his travels which included Persepolis was issued in 1778. In 1798 another Dane, Friedrich Münter, and O. G. Tychsen, a professor at Rostock, who had for some time been engaged in studying Niebuhr's inscriptions, published the results of their investigations. Tychsen recognized the frequent oblique wedge as a word-divider, and committed himself to the view that the three kinds of writing distinguished by Niebuhr represented three languages, from which the step was short to the belief that they were neither more nor less, in each case, than three versions of one and the same original text. Münter was more explicit on this latter point than Tychsen, considering the second and third of the parallel inscriptions translations of the first; better yet, he expressed the opinion, favored by the varying length of parallel inscriptions, and the different degree of complexity in their signs, that the first was alphabetic, the second syllabic, the third a sign-writing; he also determined, on the natural assumption that the inscriptions were the work of kings, the probable value of a frequently recurring group of signs, as the word meaning "king." These kings he judged to be the Achæmenidæ, whereas Tychsen had suggested the Parthian Arsacidæ. He connected with these opinions the explicit belief that the language of the simplest species would be found akin to that of the Zend Avesta, and even ventured to assign probable values to a few signs.

Thus far all was yet tentative. The beginning of actual decipherment was made in 1802. Georg Friedrich Grotefend, teacher in the gymnasium at Göttingen, in September of that year presented, to the Association for the Sciences of that city, a paper, imperfect, it is true,

and for years not thoroughly understood and valued at its true worth, but nevertheless making the transition from guesswork, more or less keen, to well-established and permanent results. It was, indeed, with brilliant conjecture that Grotefend had begun. He selected two short inscriptions from Niebuhr's collection, belonging to the simplest or "first" species, and examined them with the greatest care. He followed Niebuhr and Münter in considering the signs to be distinct letters, and Tychsen, in holding the oblique wedge for the divider of words. Münter's group for "king" occurred repeatedly in both inscriptions, and in combination with this other groups, one or two of them identical in both inscriptions. Grotefend was aware that the great French Orientalist, De Sacy, had translated royal names and titles from the Pehlevi language, in which the kings of the lines of the Sassanidæ had striven to immortalize themselves, and found that a similar arrangement of words appeared to agree with the phenomena in the inscriptions from Persepolis. While, then, he as yet knew the sound-value of not a single character, he was able to represent the approximate meaning of these two brief inscriptions:

X, great king, king of kings, son of Y, king.
Y, great king, king of kings, son of Z.

But how was he to get at any of the true sounds of this ancient language, and how apply any satisfactory test to his acute conjectures? Following Münter in the view, which alone was justified by ancient history, that the Achæmenidæ were the kings who built and beautified Persepolis, he passed in review the names of these kings. Cyrus and Cambyses would not do, because X and Y began with different signs; besides, Cyrus seemed too short for the number of signs in either X or Y, and Artaxerxes seemed too long. There were left only Darius and Xerxes. Provisionally, then, he read:

Xerxes, great king, etc., son of Darius, king.
Darius, great king, etc., son of Hystaspes.

This was capital. But he could not stop yet. How did these names sound in the original language? He knew hardly anything of the Eastern tongues, but he resorted to the Hebrew lexicon for early forms of "Darius" and "Xerxes," and to the lexicon of the Zend language, which had been recently compiled by Anquetil Duperron, for the name of Hystaspes, and the Persian word for "king." Spelling out these words in Latin letters beneath the wedge-signs, he

found that he had the sound-equivalents of thirteen cuneiform characters. This was what he reported in September, 1802. It turned out afterward that five of these values must be modified, but the other eight remain to this day as correct readings of the signs with which Grotefend connected them.

After 1802 there was another period of slow progress—almost inaction. Grotefend identified one more letter in 1815; Rask, of Norway, two more in 1826. But it was necessary that the Persian language should be more thoroughly mastered in the form preserved by the Zend Avesta, before its more ancient phenomena could be surely recognized. In 1836, Eugène Burnouf, who made himself an authority of the first rank on the Zend literature, was able to publish a complete alphabet of the Old Persian, and Professor Lassen, of Bonn, reached nearly the same results in the same year. In 1835 and the years following, Col. Henry Rawlinson, on duty in Persia, copied new inscriptions—most important among them being that on the rock at Behistun—and made several contributions to the understanding of them. Benfey, Oppert, and Spiegel followed, collecting and systematizing, until the Old Persian language, preserved in the "first species" of the trilingual inscriptions, may be said to be fairly mastered, Spiegel's book being now the standard work.

But, interesting as it was in itself, the decipherment of the Old Persian inscriptions was important chiefly as a means to the interpretation of one of the two more complicated systems found side by side with it—the so-called "third species." The second proved to have less literary and historical value than either of the other two; it was made the object of study by Westergaard, a learned Dane, by Edwin Norris, of England, and by Oppert, in France, and was called "Scythic" or "Median."

No one could have imagined, at the time when Grotefend was poring over his two little inscriptions, which the vanity of Persian kings had caused to be engraved, that, by means of that vanity, the key would be found to a vast storehouse of history and literature, compared with which, in age and human interest, the commemorative lines of the Achæmenid kings would seem petty and insignificant. Yet that there was a connection between Niebuhr's "third species" and Babylonia was already surmised. Niebuhr himself had spoken somewhat vaguely of Babylonian inscriptions, and d'Anville had, in 1761, recommended the study of them to archæologists. In 1785, Beauchamp, "Vicar-general of Babylonia," called attention to the

mounds of that region, and bricks with cuneiform inscriptions reached Paris through his agency. Plates of some of these were published by Münter in 1802, and he emphasized the strong resemblance between the characters on them and those of Niebuhr's "third species." The East India Company had a box of similar objects sent to London by their Resident in Bassora; this arrived in 1801. In the same year Joseph Hager published in London a dissertation on the subject, taking the ground that Babylonia was the original home of the wedge-writing. A stone, called "Caillou de Michaux," from its discoverer, bearing a long inscription in the same characters, was described, and plates issued, in 1802. C. J. Rich, the East India Company's Resident at Bagdad, collected remains of statues and inscriptions in 1811 and the following years. From 1840 on, the excavations of Botta, Layard, and their successors increased the amount of material enormously. The importance of the discoveries along both Euphrates and Tigris could not be questioned. Indeed, they gave rise to a good deal of popular excitement, so that books, good, bad, and indifferent, appeared in the market, whose one title to interest was that they dealt with these remarkable discoveries. This popular eagerness was historical, and particularly Biblical, in view of light expected on Scripture history; it was not at all philological or linguistic. These less exciting and severer studies were independently pursued by thoroughly devoted scholars, who reached, by separate paths, substantially the same results. The problem was, of course, less desperate in appearance than that which had confronted Grotefend, for through the labors of forty years the meaning of the "third species" of inscriptions was inferred with tolerable certainty, since it was confidently believed to be a translation of the "first." Still, the matter was difficult enough. There was no such help in the decipherment of the Old Babylonian as the Zend had been for the Old Persian. No one could tell to what family of languages the Babylonian belonged. It was necessary to start once more with the proper names, and, by gaining an acquaintance with the probable sounds of such of the new signs as, in this unknown species, were employed to represent the pronunciation of the Persian names, get a foothold for further advance. By such endeavors Löwenstern, in 1845 and 1847, Longperier, in 1847, and particularly Edward Hincks, in 1846–49, with some others working along the same lines, succeeded in making out a "Babylonian syllabary"—Hincks explained something like a hundred signs. In

1849 De Saulcy announced his reasons for thinking the unknown language to be "closely related to the Chaldee and the Hebrew; in other words, one of the numerous branches of the Shemitic family of languages." This was a great advance.

But there is one other name, already mentioned in connection with the Persian inscriptions, that deserves perhaps the chief place among the decipherers of those of Babylonia—that of Henry Rawlinson. At great sacrifice, and with almost superhuman exertions, he succeeded, in 1847, in copying the Babylonian version of the great trilingual inscription of Behistun, and since the proper names in this inscription were very numerous, and the Persian column had already been read, he was able to determine the values of 246 characters. His results were published in 1850 and 1851.

On the foundation of such labors as those of Hincks, De Saulcy, and Rawlinson the work of further decipherment could go on with much less formidable difficulties. It does not belong to an article like this to enter into the minute details of grammatical and lexical progress; to show how the mixed character of the signs was by degrees thoroughly understood, whereby some of them denote syllables, others objects or ideas, and some, both; how the fundamental resemblances and local differences between the Babylonian and the Assyrian sign-systems and languages were brought to light; what considerations led to the belief that although Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar were of Shemitic race, the signs they used to write in were devised by no Shemites, but by a people still more ancient, whose existence had been utterly forgotten by the world, until, by modern excavation, their monuments of art and of learning were recovered out of the ground. For the last thirty or forty years there has been a multitude of workers, and steady progress. Errors are constantly discovered in one particular or another, but the substantial correctness of the basis on which the work of reading, analyzing, and classifying texts proceeds is put beyond a doubt by cumulative evidence which gives to all whose studies lead them into this field a sense of firm ground beneath their feet. This constant test of former decipherments by applying their results in new cases, and the success with which it meets, are a stronger evidence that Assyriologists really know what they are doing than such a striking but rather sensational proof as was afforded in 1857, when, at the request of the Royal Asiatic Society, Rawlinson, Hincks, Fox Talbot, and Oppert independently translated a long inscription of Tiglathpileser I., and

their results were found to agree in the essentials. The steady work of these men and their coadjutors and successors—Schrader, Delitzsch, and the rest—assures us that the light on ancient history and ancient languages that is shining from the Eastern plains is the clear light of a true sun.

Second only to the decipherment of the wedge-writing in dramatic elements, and in the varied interest of its results, is the discovery of the key to the inscriptions of Egypt. Egyptologists would prefer, it may well be, not to call it second to anything. But the surprises it led to, though great, were not so great—the direct historical connections disclosed by it, though wide, were not so wide—as those due to the silent voices of Mesopotamia. Which civilization is the older, it is still too soon to decide. But the fact that there is still, and has always been, a busy life in the Delta and up the Nile Valley, preserving about the ancient remains there at least a semblance of vitality, while the great capitals of that other empire rise as shapeless mounds in lonely deserts, gives more of the sense of continuity. Archæological science has transformed Egypt, but Assyria and Babylon have been a revelation. If, however, there is thus a certain fascination in the latter which the former lacks, the former does not thereby lose its intrinsic significance.

Egypt was to the Greeks no mere name, enveloped in vague and shifting tradition. This character belonged in some degree even to the Greek notion of Persia, still more to the conception the Greek had of the empire of Ninus and the wonderful city of the hanging gardens. Egypt was nearer; its civilization was hoary, but still alive; it could be visited and studied. True, there was little sympathy between its traditions and those of Ionia and Hellas; the two cultures might live side by side, but they did not soon mix; neither entered fully into the other, and the kind of amalgamation that came about at length was not a thorough union. Still, Greece had the opportunity to understand Egypt, as she had not had to understand Nineveh and Babylon. Accordingly, we find not a little about the Nile-land in Greek historians; the accounts conflict sometimes, but yet are full enough and sustained enough to produce a distinct impression as we read.

Among other matters, the language and the writing of Egypt were objects of interest and attention. Herodotus heard of two kinds of character, a sacred and a popular, and how, while " the Greeks move

the hand from the left to the right, the Egyptians do it from the right to the left," and he adds what seemed to him, no doubt, a strange perversity, "although they do so, they themselves say that they do it toward the right, and the Greeks toward the left" (ii., 36). Diodorus and Josephus and others of less note have something to say of the two kinds of writing, and, later still, the famous church father, Clement of Alexandria, describes three kinds, which he calls "hieroglyphic," "hieratic," and "epistolary"—this last, no doubt, the same with Herodotus' popular, or, to use his term, "demotic" character.

Before Clement's time Plutarch had written about "Isis and Osiris," and described some hieroglyphs on a temple at Sais—"a child, an old man, a sparrowhawk, a fish, a hippopotamus"; "the child means beginning, the old man decay, the sparrowhawk the god, the fish hatred, and the hippopotamus shamelessness"; and the whole signifies: "O ye who come into being and pass away, the god hates evil"—and men who know tell us that Plutarch might have been much farther from the truth. But how these words were pronounced in Egyptian, or how one might go on and interpret other signs, Plutarch forgot to say.

There were not many left who could tell. The knowledge of the ancient writing, in all its kinds, was, in Clement's day, fast dying out—belonging to only a few priests, and hardly even to them. It passed quite away as Christianity, and the Coptic character, of which more presently, thrust it out. The veil dropped over the meaning of the hieroglyphs, and there was none to lift it.

Enough was known of Egypt, then, when the humanities began to come once more to the front, and men grew interested in the affairs of other and strange men, to set the imagination at work; but not enough to give the imagination real materials to vivify. It had to evolve and invent the materials it needed. Some of the resulting images are astonishing enough, in the eyes of modern scholarship, but they were the objects of much sober contemplation at the time they were formed. The background of all pictures of ancient Egyptian life and thought was mystery. The land was mysterious in its age, its river, its ruins, its unintelligible inscriptions. It was quite in keeping with all this that the hieroglyphs should be looked upon as mystic symbols. The most remarkable representative of this theory was a learned Jesuit, Kircher by name, who in the seventeenth century made vigorous efforts to understand these symbols. He believed that profound religious mysteries lay con-

cealed in the hieroglyphic signs, and was bold enough to try to put some of these into intelligible words. One group he read: "Osiris is author of fruitfulness and vegetation; his generative power brings the sacred Mophta from heaven into his kingdom"; another: "The benevolent guardian of productiveness, he who in heaven is fourfold powerful, gives, through the agency of the benevolent Mophta, the ethereal moisture to Ammon, who is mighty in the under-world, and is moved, by his statue and fit ceremonies, to exercise his power." How near the truth Kircher was will be seen from recent interpretations of the same groups. The former is a transliteration of the Greek "Autokrator" or "Emperor," and the latter means, "The august Emperor Domitian!"

In the eighteenth century there were some who took more sober views. Warburton, in England, insisted that the hieroglyphs contained the real language of ancient Egypt. Tychsen believed that some signs were mere determinatives, *i. e.*, pictures, giving a hint as to how certain words were to be interpreted. Zoëga distinguished between different sets of characters, and came to the conclusion that royal names were enclosed in oval rings. But all this was tentative, uncertain, and preparatory.

Such was the condition of things when Bonaparte, in 1798, brought his company of learned men to the mouths of the Nile, and established the Institute of Egypt. The amount and quality of the scientific knowledge gathered by these scholars, and deposited in the *Déscription de l'Égypte*, were such as to make their work an indispensable foundation for any further studies in Egyptology—taken in the wide sense. Among other things, they put within reach of scholars a great number of hieroglyphic texts, and stimulated attempts at decipherment. The treasures enshrined in these inscriptions, however, were opened to the world through the medium of an accidental discovery. This was made in 1799, not by a professional savant, but by a soldier, Lieutenant Bouchard, of the French Engineer Corps. Engaged in throwing up the earthworks bearing the name of St. Julien, at Rosetta, or Reshid, near the mouth of the Nile, he came upon a large flat stone of black basalt, bearing a long triple inscription. The lowest part was in Greek letters, the upper in Egyptian hieroglyphs, while that between the two was in a character as unknown as the hieroglyphs, but of a less pictorial, more cursive, form. It was not decreed, however, that the Institute of Egypt should reap an immediate crop of glory in connection with this discovery, epoch-

making as it proved to be. The English captured Rosetta, and the "Rosetta Stone" found a new resting-place in the British Museum. There was a certain poetic justice in the sequel. An Englishman took one step in decipherment, but it was short, and only one. The honor was reserved for a Frenchman of being the real leader in the interpretation of the monumental records of Egypt.

Even before the Englishman came a Swede, Akerblad, who devoted himself to the middle inscription, partly because it was complete, while the upper one was badly broken, and partly because it looked much simpler. As early as 1802 he was able to propose a "demotic alphabet," and he identified the word for "king," and several proper names. The same demotic inscription received examination from De Sacy, but with no results that demand our special notice. Evident as it might be that both the first inscription and the second had the same contents with the third (the Greek), these two were still far from being able to read, consecutively, the writing of either Egyptian text, and learned next to nothing about the first, which was in hieroglyphs. There was still room for the Englishman.

Thomas Young, a man of versatility and energy, famous in several departments, particularly in mathematics and natural science, became interested in the Rosetta Stone, and studied it with the utmost diligence. His pains were rewarded to only a small extent. He compared the two unknown texts minutely with the Greek, endeavoring, wherever he could see a basis for inference, to establish sound-values for the strange signs. As in the case of the wedge-writing, the proper names played a chief part. Indeed, the only important conclusion he reached which was not soon overthrown by the hands of more fortunate devotees of the advancing science, was his identification of a certain royal name. It had been concluded before by Zoëga, as we have seen, in view of temple-inscriptions, that a line passing around certain hieroglyphs marked these as representing the name of a king. Such a cartouche appeared in the hieroglyphic inscription on the stone, in a place corresponding to *Ptolemaios* in the Greek. Young proposed to consider this cartouche that of Ptolemy (Epiphanes), and was able to assign values to several of the hieroglyphs composing this name. He was busy for some years, and his chief gains were published in 1819.

But all that Young did was quite surpassed by the achievements of Jean François Champollion. Champollion began at sixteen to astonish his teachers by the extraordinary diligence and mature judg-

ment which he exhibited in matters relating to Egypt, and before he was twenty-five he had published a work on Egypt under the Pharaohs. He knew all there was to be known, and was equipped for advance. In 1810, indeed, he had already declared that the hieroglyphs must have syllable values, and could not be mere pictures, since otherwise they could not have been employed to express the Greek names which appeared in the lowest inscription on the Rosetta Stone. He was destined to prove this even more fully than Young had done. A small obelisk had been brought from Philæ, in Egypt, to England, and was in the possession of a Mr. William Banks. This bore an inscription in Greek and in hieroglyphic text, which had been copied even before it left Egypt. Champollion found that the royal cartouche which Young had interpreted as Ptolemy's occurred on this obelisk, and corresponded to Ptolemy's name in the Greek. He found Cleopatra's name also in the Greek, and identified the corresponding hieroglyphic cartouche as hers. This gave him new phonetic values for several signs. With these he proceeded to other names and other inscriptions. He read "Berenice," "Alexander," and many more. He found "Xerxes" on the vase that bore cuneiform and hieroglyphic inscriptions side by side; "Chufu," "Thotmes," "Ramses," were detected, and from such beginnings the knowledge of the sacred signs rapidly increased.

In 1832, while still a young man, Champollion died. But hieroglyphic decipherment was in a far different state from that in which he had found it; a fact which his Egyptian Grammar and Egyptian Dictionary, published after his death, shows more strikingly, perhaps, than anything else.

It was, indeed, only after long and patient trials, and on the basis of cumulative evidence, as in the case of the cuneiform decipherment, that the Egyptian texts on the Rosetta Stone and other monuments were read. But there was one aid in the work of which particular mention should be made. That was the Coptic language. When Egypt was Christianized, early in our era, the Christian literature provided for her people was not written in hieroglyphic or hieratic or demotic characters, but in an alphabet borrowed from the Greek, with addition of special signs for six sounds for which the Greek seemed to furnish no equivalent. Vulgar Egyptian in a Greek dress, this language was, and although it was largely expelled by the Arabic, when Moslemism came in, and although the priests, who retained a knowledge of its characters sufficient to pronounce

it, ceased to have any knowledge of its meaning, the literature remained, and the Coptic Bible version was a safeguard against an absolute loss of the language to science. As soon as demotic words began to be spelled out, it was found that these were essentially the same with the old Coptic, and at once a support and guide in decipherment was seen to be at hand. It would be hard to overestimate the value of this guide, and to its aid is due very much of the rapid progress made in reading Egyptian texts.

There arose, as was natural, various schools of decipherment and interpretation, and some of these wandered off along barren paths, but there was still, after Champollion's death, with little interruption, a steady increase of knowledge. Here, too, it is impossible to name more than one or two men.

Chief among these is Richard Lepsius, who was for fifty years a tireless explorer, decipherer, critic, and ethnograph, and whose expedition into Egypt and Ethiopia, under the Prussian Government, in the years 1842–45, would be enough to establish his fame if there were not much more beside. But he made a discovery, twenty years later, which has a particular claim to be noted here. The hieroglyphic part of the Rosetta Stone, as already mentioned, was badly broken. The limitation of hieroglyphic material with a Greek key led to a more and more extended use of the Coptic as a means to the older language; this afforded frequent room for doubt, and for hostile criticism. It was, therefore, a matter of great account, when Lepsius, in 1866, found at Tanis another trilingual inscription, in excellent condition, and of considerable length. This "Decree of Canopus," dating, like the Rosetta Stone, from the time of the Greek kings of Egypt, furnished in its Greek text a welcome means of testing results already obtained. That it could not do much beyond this is a testimony to the worth of previous studies, than which nothing could be more satisfactory.

In the meantime available material had greatly multiplied. Lepsius' own expedition had vastly increased the number of temple inscriptions which could be studied. Mariette and others had worked in similar lines. Papyrus records in great numbers had been found and read. Students multiplied. Any practicable list of names would leave out some that deserve mention. De Rougé, Birch, Ebers, Brugsch, Lieblein, Maspero—these are only specimens. The ancient language of Egypt, in its ancient clothing, is growing familiar to young men, to-day. "We do not decipher the hieroglyphs

any more, we read them," one of the guild has said. Much has been done, and yet there is far more to be done, in which an American may be pardoned for wishing that Americans might have a hand.

The story, often told, but never quite worn out, may end here. Through Young, Champollion, and Lepsius three systems of writing, and the changing dialects of thousands of years, have been turned from dumb monuments into speaking voices, just as through Grotefend and Burnouf and Rawlinson a half-dozen kinds of cuneiform texts, and as many separate languages, have been rescued from forgotten tombs.

It would be pleasant to go on and recall some of the strange secrets which these long-shut lips have uttered, since they were raised from the dead. But it is worth something merely to imprint afresh on our minds the law of the growth of human knowledge—how one sows and another reaps; how others have labored, and we enter into their labors; with what vast expenditure of force and ingenuity each little gain is bought; and yet, how all this expenditure, which in some moods seems like waste, testifies unceasingly of that deep-seated belief in the worth of knowledge, and that self-abandoning desire to have problems solved and truth uncovered, and the real facts about the world and the people in it set in clear light, which reassures us, amid the clamorous push of material things, and gives us a confident expectation of intellectual progress for the human race.

FRANCIS BROWN.

RAILROAD ABUSES, AT HOME AND ABROAD.

FEW of the complaints against the American railroad system are wholly unjustified, and few are wholly justified. The great majority belong to neither of these classes. They are partly justified, because the evils complained of are real; they are at the same time partly unjustified, because those evils are not the fault of the system itself, but are to a large extent inevitable.

If we find that an evil which exists in the United States has been avoided elsewhere, we are generally warranted in laying the blame upon our system of management. But if we find that same evil has existed everywhere, under totally different conditions, it is presumably the fault of human nature rather than of any particular system. Such abuses must be met by increased publicity and more stringent responsibility, rather than by any change of ownership or management. It is here that the necessity of comparing the legislation of different countries makes itself most strongly felt, and where the lack of such knowledge leads to the gravest mistakes. Many of the arguments popularly urged in favor of a State railroad system are based upon the existence of evils in America which are just as distinctly felt under State railroad ownership in Europe.

The complaints may be grouped under four main heads: waste of capital, extortion, discrimination, and political corruption.

That there has been an enormous waste of capital in American railroads, no one will think of denying. Many roads are built which are not needed; necessary and unnecessary roads are constructed in a manner calculated to put money into the hands of their builders, rather than to serve the interests either of the legitimate investors or of the public. Of the 30,000 miles of railroad built during the years 1880–1882, less than half could be considered necessary to the development of the country. A very considerable portion were "parallel" roads; that is, they depended for their existence, not upon new localities which they could serve and new business which they could accommodate, but upon business which they could take away from roads already in existence. Parallel railroad building is

generally a waste of capital. The business can be done more economically by one line than by two. Any gain to the shipper from the low competitive rates is merely temporary, and is more than offset by the wide-spread commercial depression which such waste of capital involves.

But it is not for the sake either of the investor or the shipper that speculative railroad building is promoted. It is for the sake of the inside ring which makes a profit out of contracts for construction. If the members of such a ring can once get control of the bondholders' money, they can make lucrative contracts with themselves in matters both of construction and of finance. Cases are not infrequent where members of an inside ring have built roads at a cost of not over $15,000 per mile, but have received securities in payment on which they realized twice that amount, and whose face value was perhaps $40,000 or $50,000 per mile. A road which has cost only $15,000 per mile is generally a miserable piece of work. Yet by this means such roads were capitalized at a high rate, and made to appear valuable. The difference between the nominal and the real cost had largely gone into the pockets of the speculators. This is the worst form of stock watering. The process by which a speculative director is allowed to use his position as a means of transferring the investors' money into the pockets of his friends, is a lasting disgrace to American law. In England, a director is forbidden to have a personal interest in contracts with his own company, and the provision has proved a salutary one.

With all this inflation of capital, it would naturally be supposed that the nominal cost of railroads in America is higher than in other countries. This is not the case. It is not so, even if we take into account the differences in the quality of work. This is a remarkable fact which it is difficult to explain. The railroads of the United States are capitalized at $62,000 per mile on an average; those of Europe at $115,000. It is undoubtedly true that the railroads of Europe are far better constructed than our own; but it may well be doubted whether the difference in excellence of construction* amounts to $50,000 per mile. If we go more into detail, we find the cost in the different countries, under various systems of ownership, to be as follows:

* It is here that the difference must be accounted for. The right of way costs relatively much more in Europe than in America; but it is a small item—probably not much over $10,000 per mile in France or Germany.

	OWNERSHIP.	COST PER MILE.
Great Britain,	Private,	$204,000
Belgium,	Mainly by State,	132,000
France,	Mainly private,	128,000
Germany,	Mainly by State,	105,000
Austria and Hungary,	Mixed,	105,000
Italy,	Mixed,	92,000
Russia,	Mainly private,	80,000
British India,	Mixed,	66,000
United States,	Private,	62,000
Australia,	State,	50,000

The enormous cost of the English roads is largely explained by differences in the method of construction, which any one who has travelled on them will readily call to mind. Apart from England, the cost of State and private railroad systems balances very closely. The only large system which has cost less per mile than that of the United States is in Australia. The cheapness of this, at first sight, might seem an argument in favor of State railroads. But when we consider the character of the country and of its traffic, the only wonder is that the difference should be so small.

Do these figures mean that there is less water in American railroad capital than is commonly supposed? or do they mean that there has been a corresponding waste of money in the construction of foreign roads? To a certain extent, both. It is not fair to deduct from the capitalization of American roads the whole apparent amount of water. The sums which appear on the balance-sheet but were never actually expended on the road are offset to some extent by other sums which were actually expended but do not now appear on the balance-sheet. In certain sections of the country a great deal of bona-fide investment has been wiped out or scaled down by foreclosure. In other cases, roads have been improved by investing their surplus earnings, without corresponding stock dividends. This was quite largely the case in 1879, when roads which had previously been living from hand to mouth suddenly found themselves in position to make much-needed additions to their property. A road which has been too cheaply built at the outset is, sooner or later, forced to do something of this kind.

Nor is it fair to estimate the true capitalization of our roads by the probable cost of duplication. If every company could have foreseen accurately its present traffic, we should have been saved many mistakes and much waste of capital. The necessity of finding things

out by experience may add fifty or a hundred per cent. to the cost of any business enterprise. This is, perhaps, the chief reason why State railroads are not able to practise better economy. Their managers are slower to learn by experience. They are obliged to do things by rule and by schedule; and, without actual corruption, the Government officials are often interested in the maintenance of antiquated rules and schedules which give them employment in their accustomed lines. The Belgian railroad shops, at the outset, were the best in the world. Fifteen years later, they were still managed on the same old system, while the rest of the world had made improvements which left them far behind. It was not until they felt the stress of private railroad competition at their own doors that they were again forced into living activity. The same slowness makes itself felt in the purchase of materials of every kind. The mass of forms renders it impossible to take advantage of a favorable market; and the Government is apt to end by buying at exactly the wrong time.

The same thing makes itself felt on a larger scale in the misjudgment of public officials with regard to the building of new lines. It is often urged by the advocates of a State railroad system that the State can theoretically avoid much of the waste of capital due to the ill-planned building of private lines. But it would be a bold thing to say that it practically does avoid it. The Government of Prussia has proved a great sinner in the building of parallel roads. That of France has wasted much money by making its plans quite without regard to the means of performing them. Almost all governments are moved by political reasons for railroad building far more than industrial ones. Our own experience of State public works in America by no means confirms the theory that waste of capital will be avoided by such a system.

These various causes are sufficient to account for the high capitalization of European roads. We may differ in our views as to what constitutes a just estimate of the proper cost of roads in America or in Europe, but there is one general conclusion which can hardly be avoided, and which is involved in the figures themselves. The waste of capital due to private speculation and corruption in America, appalling as it is, is offset by the waste due to public misjudgment and inefficiency in foreign countries.

The complaint of extortion, in its most common form, is closely connected with the complaint of stock-watering. It is charged that

the public is habitually "taxed to pay dividends on watered stock"; that high rates result from this cause; and that, if such illegitimate profits were cut off, we might expect an enormous reduction in rates. Of all the charges against railroads this is the most popular; yet it is the one which has the least foundation. It rests on mistakes of fact and fallacies of reasoning. It is closely allied to the popular view which seeks to explain low wages by high profits of manufacturers, and which assumes that if manufacturers' profits were cut down the wage-workers would be greatly benefited. The idea that rates would be lowered if dividends were reduced is exactly on a par with the idea that wages would be increased if manufacturers' profits were lessened. Yet many of those who indignantly repel the latter view, are loud in support of the former. It is one of those cases where it is easy for a man to detect a fallacy which works against his own pocket, but hard for him to recognize the same fallacy when the positions are reversed.

The first condition which enables a railroad to make low rates, or a factory to pay high wages, is efficient management; the second condition, closely connected with the first, is rapid development of business. If we attempt to cut down profits we check both these results. Such an attempt keeps wages down instead of raising them, keeps rates up instead of lowering them. Over and over again it has been proved that the endeavor to cut down railroad profits is either ineffective or suicidal. Those factories which make large profits are generally the ones which pay high wages; those railroads whose dividends are high are generally the ones whose rates are low. High capitalization goes hand in hand with low charges. Within the last twenty years the capitalization of railroads in the United States has increased from $50,000 to $62,000, or 24 per cent.; yet the average freight charges during that time have decreased about 50 per cent. The same difference is seen when we compare different systems of railroad in the United States; the charge for road and equipment being, for certain reasons, a fairer basis of comparison than stock and debt. (The figures are taken for the year 1884.)

Roads with large Capitalization.	Cost of Road and Equipment per mile.	Rates per ton-mile.
Erie,	$310,000	$0.72
New York Central,	210,000	0.83
Pennsylvania,	140,000	0.74
Baltimore & Ohio,	130,000	0.75
Lake Shore,	97,000	0.65

Roads with moderate Capitalization.	Cost of Road and Equipment per mile.	Rates per ton-mile.
Louisville & Nashville, ...	$58,000	$1.29
Rock Island, ...	53,000	1.10
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, . . .	45,000	1.29
Chicago & Northwestern, ...	44,000	1.31
Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, . . .	31,000	1.29
General Average for United States, .	55,000	1.12

These figures are in many respects imperfect. The nominal cost in the first four instances is based on the road directly owned, the returns of rates on road operated. Nor does the capitalization correspond to the nominal or actual cost; being much less in the case of the Baltimore & Ohio, and greater in the case of most other roads. But with all the unavoidable sources of error, the contrast between the first half and the last half of the above table is enough to show that low rates go with large traffic rather than with small capital. A railroad does not base its rates upon its fixed charges in the way that is commonly supposed. When any reduction is considered, the question is whether it will increase the volume of traffic fast enough to make up for the smaller margin which the lower rate leaves above the train and station expenses. The lower the train expenses are, the lower the limit of possible reduction. And the train expenses will be lowest on those lines whose construction is the best, and which presumably have cost the most. Large capital thus becomes, indirectly, a cause of low rates. But if the law limits the amount which may be divided, it takes away the inducement to develop business, and destroys this advantage. Instead of producing reductions in charge, it actually prevents them.

There is one form of the charge of "taxing traffic" which it is more difficult to meet. It is said that railroad companies enter upon pooling contracts for this very purpose; and that the high profits thus obtained, so far from stimulating the extension of business, actually tend to deaden it. It must be admitted that there is a great temptation for a railroad pool to make this mistake; and that in a number of cases it has actually been made, to such an extent as to react against the railroads themselves. Many an instance of parallel railroad building is due to a failure to reduce rates by a combination of existing roads. On the other hand, it may be said that the law is partly responsible for this state of things. Railroad combinations, for reasons which will presently appear, are a necessity. They exist in all countries and under all systems of ownership. Properly

managed, they help the general public just as much as they help the railroads, by enabling the railroad managers to pursue a far-sighted policy. But in America we have refused them all legal recognition, and have made it impossible for them to pursue any such far-sighted policy. Without by any means stopping their growth, we have deprived ourselves of the power of guiding it. We have in a measure forced them to live for the present, and to charge unduly high rates while they can, because they do not know how soon the power of enforcing their contracts may be broken. Yet, even in this case, it is a mistake to say that pool rates are based upon watered stock. They are not based upon stock at all. They are, like the local rates of the railroads, based, primarily, upon the probable volume of traffic to be secured, and secondarily, upon operating expenses.

If we compare the actual rates charged in different countries, we find that average for freight in the United States per ton-mile is the lowest of any—about 1.06 cents. Belgium comes next, with an average of about 1.3 cents; Prussia averages about 1.35 cents. Austria and France are considerably higher—each a little over a cent and a half; while Great Britain is higher still, though it is impossible to tell exactly what the average charge on her railroads is. In passenger rates the matter is to some extent reversed. The average charge in the United States is 2.2 cents; in Great Britain probably about 2 cents; in France and Austria, from 1⅔ to 1¾ cents; in Prussia, 1.3 cents; in Belgium as low as 1.2 cents.

These figures show that our freight rates are relatively low, and our passenger rates relatively high; another illustration of the effect of volume of business upon rates, for it is impossible for our roads to develop a heavy passenger traffic like that of the thickly-settled countries of Europe. The number of passengers carried on the railroads of Western Europe is about twice the number of tons of freight moved; in America, the freight tonnage is decidedly in excess of the number of passengers. A large part of our railroads regard their passenger business simply in the light of an advertisement or inducement to attract freight. They actually squander their transportation facilities by an abuse of the free-pass system, which costs one of our leading companies, according to the testimony of its president, $2,000 per day.

It is in the management of the passenger business that State railroads have shown themselves most enterprising and most successful. The experiment of cheap working-men's trains has been

tried with advantage in Belgium, Saxony, and to a less extent in other countries. The social gain to the community in relieving the crowded cities has been great; while the development of the traffic has been such that the railroads have suffered no loss. Unfortunately the efforts of our railroads in extending the passenger business have generally favored the long-distance or high-class traffic. Many a working-man who could readily pay a monthly rate like that of the Belgium trains, for short distance and cheap service, is deterred by the fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five dollars necessary for the regular quarterly commutation. Whether the establishment of cheap morning and evening suburban service would pay directly, is perhaps uncertain. Of its indirect advantages there seems hardly the shadow of doubt.

While the charge of extortion, or high average rates, is generally a mistake, the charge of discrimination, or arbitrary differences in rates, is only too well founded.

No language is too strong to characterize the evils of the system of special rates, by which the business of certain individuals and localities is destroyed for the benefit of their more fortunate competitors. Fortunately, the attention of the public is thoroughly awake to the magnitude of the evil. The agitation upon the subject may have produced little positive fruit in the form of law, but it is shaping a public sentiment stronger than any mere act of the Legislature. Even the railroad men themselves have ceased to defend the system in its extreme form. There was a time, not very long ago, when they indignantly repelled the demand for publicity of rates, and insisted that it was none of A's business what the railroad was charging his competitor B. Few men would now be found to take this position in theory, whatever might be the actual practice of their roads on the point in question. The point at issue now is not, whether discrimination is an evil, but how far it is possible to avoid it. And on this point the experience of different nations is tolerably conclusive.

In the first place, it is out of the question to base differences in rates simply on differences in cost of service. This theory was never really carried out under any transportation system. The old turnpikes charged more for pleasure carriages than for heavy teams, although they actually caused less wear to the road. Why? Because a rate which would not seriously interfere with pleasure driving would be such a burden upon the teamster as to check the development of

his business. The low rates were given where they would develop a large increase in traffic. Where it made comparatively little difference, they were kept high. This is the real meaning of the principle of charging "what the traffic will bear," and it is the plan on which all the most efficient transportation agencies have been managed.

Second, the worst forms of discrimination can be avoided only by a system of pools. Otherwise the chance for secretly extending traffic at the expense of a rival road will lead to underhand favors of every kind. These abuses are worst where railroad competition is most active. No mere law to secure publicity and equality of rates is effective unless this main motive for secrecy is removed. The European governments have come to recognize pools as a necessity. They regulate them carefully; but they also encourage them. The Government railroads themselves enter into divisions of traffic with private lines, and even with water routes. The countries where the evils of discrimination are best avoided are those where pooling is carried to the fullest extent.

Third, where pools are sanctioned, or at least tolerated, it is in large measure possible to do away with secrecy of rates and with personal discrimination; but it is impossible under any circumstances to avoid a certain amount of local discrimination. For ten years Bismarck, with all the powers of the Prussian Government behind him, has been trying to enforce a system of schedule rates which shall be fair to local points; and yet, at the present day, three-fifths of the Prussian traffic is carried at rates which are avowedly "exceptional." In fact, the question whether a road is owned by the State or by a company, makes remarkably little difference with the amount of discrimination which it practises. Under the mixed system of State and private roads, the State roads themselves are the worst offenders. Where the State has a monopoly, matters are not so bad; but the improvement is due to the completeness of the monopoly, and not to the mere fact of State ownership.

The general conclusion is that a certain amount of discrimination is unavoidable; but that the remedy is to be sought in increased publicity and responsibility, rather than in any particular system of ownership.

Would such publicity and responsibility be increased by Government management in America? It is hard to see how any one can answer this question in the affirmative. The action of the tax as-

sessor is probably less responsible and less influenced by public opinion than that of any other man with whom we have pecuniary dealings. Well might the Italian Commission say that in managing railroads the State is liable to tax industry, and that in so taxing it the State is more omnipotent and less responsible than a private corporation. If the State cannot control outside parties, it is pretty certain not to control its own functionaries when they are placed in similar positions.

The complaint concerning the influence of corporations in politics to-day has too much truth; but is it to be supposed that matters will be improved when the connection is made ten times closer, and when the inside ring of political managers is substituted for the inside ring of railroad managers? The votes of the people are as powerless to exercise any effective control in the former case as the votes of the stockholders in the latter. Where political considerations come into railroad management, they will almost always be disastrous. The Belgian State railroads are well managed; yet the recent experience of Belgium furnishes examples of this. In a Parliamentary debate concerning the unfavorable results of Belgian management in recent years, one orator did not hesitate to say:

"It is we, the members of the House, who are most to blame. It is we who are to blame for incessantly demanding favors which the finances do not warrant; and our motive for so doing, I have no hesitation in saying, is to make ourselves popular in our districts. It is a notorious fact that there are trains running which bear the name of the representative through whose influence they have been secured; some of them almost empty, yet established by political influence and that alone."

And another member, perhaps the most careful student of railroad administration in all Belgium, made haste to confirm this:

"The gentleman is right in saying that the House is in large measure to blame for the deficit. The House, collectively and individually, is at all times urging increased expenditure. The members themselves are constantly urged in that direction—besought, pledged, or forced, by those who will make these things a party weapon."

When such favors are granted by private roads, the money comes out of the pockets of the stockholders—when they are given by a State road, the public makes up the deficit. There is no limit to the reserve fund available for the sake of influencing prominent shippers or bribing doubtful constituencies.

State railroad ownership is unquestionably desired by a very

considerable part of the American people. They are so impressed with the evils of the present system that they do not stop to inquire what would be the effect of the change. To belittle the existing evils only makes the sentiment stronger. Under these circumstances, it is important to keep prominently in view the fact that State ownership has not avoided waste of capital; that it has not given lower rates than we enjoy in America; that where it has prevented discrimination, it has done so by means quite independent of the particular form of ownership. Publicity and responsibility to the law are far more important than any radical change of system. The conflict of interests between the railroads and the public, as far as it exists at all, is less dangerous than the conflict which must arise if corrupt political management and corrupt railroad management were to fall into the same hands.

ARTHUR T. HADLEY.

SHAM LEGISLATION.

"When legislators keep the law,

. . . . . .

Then order your ascension robe."—HOLMES.

TWO generations ago the business of the Assembly in the State of New York was transacted in a most methodical manner. The Speaker's office, like that of many a member, was in his hat. The Clerk had no private rooms, but his immense semicircular desk was honeycombed with pigeon holes labelled in orthodox style. The Speaker took the bill that was introduced from the page, read it "by title" and then handed it to the Clerk. Once in the hands of the Governor, it was never recalled. There was no such thing as a sub-committee of the whole previous to the year 1850, and only occasionally, for many years after that date, was business delegated to such a committee. The chairman of the committee of ways and means made his report from the Clerk's desk, where he put all the amendments and declared them carried or rejected. The chairmen of all such important committees as those on claims and canals—there was no railroad committee then—always reported in writing the results of committee meetings held, for the most part, in the private rooms of such chairman. There was an honest and a full discussion of bills, even down to the village charters, in committee of the whole. Two daily sessions were always held, and sometimes three. When it is also recalled that the senators and members remained over Sunday and had their families with them much more generally than they do now, the wonder ceases that much more hard work was performed, and that the session did not last long beyond the traditional "hundred days."

The sight of the assemblymen seated at their desks, each with a candle in a socket, and the cheerful glow thrown over the whole by the huge wood fires that blazed on either hand, would shame the modern assemblymen, who can devote but a bare four days to the public service, and then leave for their homes, not forgetting, however, to sign receipts and draw their pay. Even in that matter we notice a vast change since the days when the members and pages received

$3 per day each, to be drawn in person from the proper State officer, and when every member went to the post-office after his own mail. The method to-day is to have the money brought ready to the members' hands and to have post-offices within the new Capitol—one for the Senate and the other for the Assembly. The number of officials about the Assembly was also very much less than it is at the present day; the Sergeant-at-Arms, for instance, being required to take charge of all the documents that were provided. Yet there was less confusion than at present, because no one was allowed upon the floor, except by a vote of the House. Afterward a railing was thrown across the rear portion of the Chamber, and the space was reserved for ladies and their escorts; but for many years they had to content themselves with the rudest of wooden benches. In those days speeches were rarely made during the hours which the Assembly devoted to honest and faithful work. Whenever the members wished to deliver a long address it was announced that they would speak to the Governor's message or to some other equally convenient objective point. The orators were thus enabled to speak to the galleries and floor, packed in every part, without fear of interruption.

A veteran of those former days recently came back to Albany, to renew his duties as a legislator. The old Capitol had been destroyed, and with it had gone the older ways of doing business. The new ways were in striking contrast with the old, and they are best understood by tracing the progress of a bill through the Legislature. The very beginning of a bill's life is a sham. The Speaker calls, "Introduction of bills," and begins to name the counties in alphabetical order, when perhaps a member rises with a bill in his hand. The Speaker announces, "The gentleman from Stark, Mr. Jones, introduces a bill. First reading of a bill." The page boy runs to the Clerk, the Speaker meanwhile saying, "The people of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly do enact as follows." Thus the first reading of the bill takes places before any officer of the Assembly has it in his possession. The Speaker then says: "Second reading and by title unless objected to." The Clerk gives the "second" reading in the words (to state a case): "An act for the relief of crippled soldiers," while the bill itself may provide that cats shall not make night hideous, or that there shall be no more imprisonment for theft. The bill is referred to the committee on militia, the one to which it would naturally go; but, for special reasons or by request of the member introducing it,

it may be referred to some other than the regular committee, so that it may be more directly under the control of the introducer.

And just here we must pause a moment to note things that sometimes happen in the Speaker's chair—that the Speaker too often asks the Clerk what shall be done with a bill. More than one bill has been killed or advanced by an understanding between the Speaker and the Clerk at the time of its introduction. It goes without saying that both the Speaker of the Assembly and the Clerk of the Senate have vast power in the way of refusing to recognize members or to put their motions and appeals—a power that is often used against the equitable side of the question.

Once referred to a committee, the bill is beyond the reach of scrutiny, for the present at least; especially if the chairman of the committee shall have been convinced that it is a measure the interests of which he does not care to have advanced by an early airing, or possibly by any airing at all. The only recourse then for information is to wait until the bill comes from the hands of the printer and is placed on the files. Long before that time arrives, the files are encumbered by a mass of other measures, many of them likely to conceal a scheme in some section or line. To keep a close scrutiny over all these bills any member would require from one to three clerks very familiar with legislation, or the bill, instead of being advanced might slumber in the committee and never be reported. The bills are seldom acted upon in the order of their reference. A resolution of the Assembly calling for a report on any specified bill may bring the matter to the consideration of the whole House; but when there is no knowledge of the existence of the scheme aforesaid, who will make a demand that a report shall be made upon a bill of which he has no knowledge whatever? The member introducing it will surely make no move to stir it until a more favorable time for its passage arrives. It is true the delay sometimes defeats its own object, but in the minds of schemers delay is better than ventilation of the matter; for another Legislature may pick up a dead bill, but the present Legislature would never notice a disgraced bill.

The proceedings in committee, also, are often of the briefest character. The chairman takes up a bill with the remark that it is a good bill, and the committee thereupon votes to report it; or a member opposes the bill, and the whole committee follows his lead. Here is the great field for "log rolling" some bills into everlasting

quiet and others into undue prominence. Four years ago there was a general inquiry about the legislative committees and the ignorance of their members as to what was going on during the "executive" meetings so closely guarded from reportorial ears. The inquiry was called out by the statement of what was considered almost incredible as a fact, namely, that bills of which certain of the committeemen had never heard, had been reported to the Assembly. This assertion was founded on facts that were, and still are, observable at any time. A more notable instance took place in the Legislature of 1885, when the members of a certain committee publicly accused the chairman of reporting a bill on which no vote had been taken; and afterward so reconstructed their memories as to recall the fact that they had themselves voted to report it.

If a bill goes through the committee and is reported favorably, it is assigned a certain number on "general orders;" that is to say, it will be considered in the committee of the whole and probably ordered to a third reading. Just here one of the worst abuses of modern legislation has crept in under the name of "unanimous consent." A member has a bill that should never have been introduced at all, or at least should have been introduced earlier in the session. He asks unanimous consent because "the bill is purely a local bill and nobody objects to it." On the strength of this he asks that without all the tedious process of the regular committee and the committee of the whole it shall at once be ordered to a third reading. If any one in behalf of the best interests of the State objects, he is at once belabored and so importunately besought to withdraw his objections, that he usually does it as a matter of personal friendship for the father of the bill.

When the proper time comes, if it has not been persistently driven to the rear by "log rolling" other bills ahead of it, the bill comes up for a "third reading." This time it is supposed to be read through; but a few lines at the beginning and at the end are all that the Clerk troubles himself about, unless a special request is made. During the call of the roll it is no uncommon thing to see members turn to their colleagues and hurriedly ask: "What's this?" "What bill is it?" and "What is there about it?" The reply comes no less hurriedly: "Oh, it's all right; it's Doe's bill," or "Roe's bill," as the case may be. This is enough. Down goes an "Ay." Scarcely one member in five responds to his name on the first roll-call, and still fewer would respond if the Speaker did not

occasionally announce that the bill would be declared lost if the members did not answer. In fact, so little attention is paid, that the Clerk is obliged to record the vote of many a silent member if he can be discovered in any corner of the room.

The greater part of the "jobs" are generally held till the closing days of the Legislature, in the hope that their demerits will be hidden in the confusion that then reigns supreme. At such a time, good, bad and indifferent bills are passed without regard to their quality, the object being to "expedite" business as much as possible. A bill of the jobbery order is much more readily passed in one House when it has succeeded in passing the other. In such a case less careful attention is given to it, and its very success is pleaded in its favor. Old hands at the business of introducing bills know, by an instinctive glance, whether a bill should go to the Senate first or to the Assembly. Their predictions generally prove true; for they know thoroughly the traits and inclinations of the old members, and they can presume upon the average new member's not proceeding beyond a certain point in the transaction of business.

What has been already said applies more directly to the methods in the Assembly, but it is to a certain extent true of the Senate also. The reason why more "jobs" are originally introduced in the lower House is that it has a greater number of members, and that a few ruling spirits on each side take charge of affairs, while the rest follow. A bill may be introduced, reported favorably, put upon its third reading, and rushed through unread, not one member in twenty beyond the immediate friends of the measure being cognizant of a single one of its provisions. A notable instance of this "railroading" of legislation was shown during the extra session of 1885 called to pass a census bill. The Assembly met and adjourned several times a day for two days, till the Senate had prepared and passed a bill. Then it was rushed over to the Assembly, introduced, considered in committee of the whole without debate, reported favorably, and passed—after not less than a score of speeches—in a little over an hour. Not one in a dozen of the assemblymen read the bill or even listened to its perfunctory reading by the Clerk.

Hard indeed would be the lot of any one who was condemned to sit idly by and see and hear only the sober part of what is going on in the legislative halls. There are *contretemps* and passages-at-arms that (save as a startling reminder that the interests of the State are not being subserved) brighten up what would otherwise be

dull, stupid, and uninstructive. A certain member, when the roll was called on a bill, asked the Clerk for "a detailed statement of the count." Another member spoke thus of a bill: "Mr. Speaker, this is a party bill, and I ask my party friends to stand by me and help me to pass it." On another occasion when the Assembly showed signs of weariness he announced: "Mr. Speaker, I will now withdraw all my further remarks on this bill." A third member commenced to speak against a bill affecting some of his property: "Mr. Speaker, I arose in a *quasi* capacity." Here a colleague pulled his coat-tail. The member shook him off, and began again: "I arose in a *quasi* capacity." Again came a jerk at his coat-tail, and in a hoarse whisper the colleague was heard to say: "Whisht! come off wid yer Greek." Still another member delivered himself thus on the question of contract labor in the State prisons: "This is the vital cobra of destruction that is stamping out the lives of the working men in this State." On one occasion a pugnacious member of the majority listened as long as he could to the attack of a minority member upon his party, and then broke out with: "I warn the member on the minority side of the House that he shall not dare to come in here and shake his shibboleth over our heads." The leader of the majority was pained that such a mistake had been made, and striding up to the member, he exclaimed: "Confound the likes of ye! don't you know enough to hold your tongue! why do you put on foreign airs? you don't know the alpha and omega of your own language." Lest it may appear that all the offenders are in the Assembly, we may note the way that a leading senator opposed an appropriation for printing a scientific work that had been undertaken by the State. "Do the people of this commonwealth," he asked, indignantly, "want their hard-earned money spent on lamellibranchiata? Why, they never saw one, never heard of one, nor anybody else. There ain't no such thing. I wouldn't have one in the house if there was. In my opinion the tax-ridden Americans have had ologies enough, and I'm opposed to spending a cent on paleontology, or doxology, or any other such rubbish. For I don't understand it: nobody does."

Amusing as are these stories they must not, as legislative pleasantries, be considered the only matters that pass current through the halls and corridors. There are rumors and statements that bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every honest man who hears them. For instance, the announcement was once made in the pub-

lic press that a seat in the Senate of the State of New York is worth $50,000 to the holder. Another statement, in private, was in answer to the question: "Is Assemblyman so-and-so wealthy?" "He must be," was the reply, "for he comes from a district where they have to have money to carry it." Still another statement was to the effect that several years ago it took $10,000 to elect a Senator of the United States. The manipulators of the Legislature know the venal members if there are any; and it is whispered that there is one occasionally. The knowledge that a member has a price, or "inducement," is often positive. The new members rarely share in such prosperity as attends certain of the older members, for they can be controlled, as a rule, by means which have less of a market value; such as the threat that they will not be placed on good committees, or that they must vote for this measure and against that one "because —— says so," referring to some political leader who is a terror to the novice, and with whom he must stand on good terms or expect no further favors. Thus the innocent legislator is led astray by an appeal to his feelings; and the designing legislator is swerved from the path of virtue by the temptations offered to his pocket-book. The writer could name an ex-senator who was never seen with the lobbyists in Albany; but as regularly as Saturday came around he went to an office in New York city, received his pay for past votes, and took instructions as to his votes in the future. Another ex-senator said of a former colleague: "I have no doubt he has sold my vote over and over again, after first finding out which way I intended to vote." It was a notorious fact in the Legislature of 1884 that out of 128 members of Assembly about 90 were corruptible, while in the Legislature of 1885 there were about 70 who bore that reputation. So that we are not surprised to hear one senator rushing to the defence of another, who had been accused of soliciting money for a favorable report on a bill, and saying: "Do you think —— would be seen in a thing of that kind? No, sir; it isn't the Albany style." After all, it is an open question whether the lobbyist or the member is the most willing. It is related that a lobbyist approached a law-maker and asked him to vote for a certain bill, but failed to touch on the financial question. The member listened patiently, and when the lobbyist finished said to him: "Do you know what the Lord said to Zaccheus when he was in the tree?" The lobbyist admitted that he did not. "Well," said the virtuous law-maker, "you hunt up a Bible and find out.

When you have posted yourself come back, and I'll give you my answer." The lobbyist departed, and in due time returned. "I searched a Bible, and found that the Lord commanded Zaccheus to come down." "That is just what I say; come down," replied the member.

Quite as bad as the lobbyists are the legislative "strikers" who introduce bills aimed at some particular interest—usually one that is controlled by a corporation—for the sake of frightening the party into "coming down," as a condition of not pressing the bill. Every year some new device for "striking" somebody comes to the front. It is not always in the form of a bill. It frequently recites the wrongs of widows and orphans and then demands an investigation —of course by a packed committee—into the alleged wrongs. It is amusing to see how easily the widows and orphans' interests are allowed to go on as they were if the corporation complained of consents to pay the price of the striker's silence. It is instructive to note the number of bills and resolutions of this nature that never pass beyond the point just short of actually doing anything.

After passing so many rocks and shoals the bills that are successful reach the executive chamber. But even then the Governor is not always sure that he is reading the same bill that has been passed by the Legislature. A noted politician of the last generation said: "What is the use of wasting money on the Legislature? If you want anything done you can do it for one-tenth the expense in the engrossing-room." Something of this sort must have happened near the end of the session of 1885. A bill relative to police pensions in New York city had passed both houses, and, after the adjournment, it was signed by the Governor. When the new law was read in print the discovery was made that after it had left the Legislature a clause had been inserted which retired the superintendent of police, one inspector, five captains, and over one hundred other members of the force. Even if a bill reaches the Governor intact, it is not safe from manufactured public opinion. A senator recently called on the Executive and declared that public sentiment was all in favor of one of his bills. "I have received a large number of letters," he remarked, "approving this bill; and I have no doubt you have also, Governor." The Governor did not tell the senator, what he stated afterward in private, that he had in his pocket a letter from a citizen enclosing an appeal from the senator urging the citizen to write to the Governor about the bill. And yet, in spite of all these draw-

backs, an inconsiderate public will blame the Governor for not devoting more time to the consideration of bills. The truth is, that at no stage of their progress are the bills so carefully scrutinized as after they come into the possession of the Governor.

Ten years ago—and that was after Tweed's time, too—there were about half a thousand laws added to the statute-book with every new session of the Legislature. The malady of passing bills—"the natural fecundity of low organisms"—appears to have been at its height about those days. In 1874 the total number of laws passed was 653; in 1875, 634; in 1876, 448; in 1877, 475; in 1878, 418; in 1879, 542; in 1880, 500; in 1881, 713; in 1882, 410; in 1883, 523; in 1884, 555; in 1885, 553. We may take one of the later years as an example of the whole. Out of about 500 laws, 14 were amendments to the codes; 58 were either amendments to old charters or grants of new ones; 65 appropriated money and regulated the several executive departments of the Government; 35 were escheat bills which were wholly unnecessary; 198 were local regulations of various kinds, which included 54 special laws for cities and villages. This left only 164 laws, or less than one-third for the great questions of the State. Any number of special laws, which the Constitution forbids, are masked as general laws. On the subject of oleomargarine four laws were enacted at cross purposes. One stated that the product might be sold if it were marked; another declared the sale in any shape to be a criminal act; while two other laws prescribed each a different penalty for the same offence in regard to this product. A special law for Schenectady County allowed arrests to be made without process. Some other county wanted the same privilege; while another clamored for the special mechanics' lien law which had been formerly enacted for Onondaga County.

Bad as is this mass of actually enacted laws, it would surprise even the most intelligent of our citizens to see how much worse the bills are when they make their first appearance. A charter for a literary university contained the words, "expultion," and "diaplomas." Glaring mistakes of ignorance both in spelling and in the subject matter of the bill might be remedied, or avoided altogether, by appointing some competent authority whose duty it should be to advise the Legislature upon the drafting of new laws. The authority might be placed in the hands of a single person, known as the legislative counsel, who should be paid a reasonable compensation by the

State. It would be his duty to revise all bills before their final passage, in order to detect errors and imperfections, and to act as general legal adviser for the Legislature. But no legal adviser could be expected to discover the correctly drawn bills that contain the worst of the schemes. Nothing could have been more correct in outward form than that which so altered the laws as to throw out of gear the whole machinery of town supervisors throughout the State just because a certain senator wished to annoy a certain supervisor. The senator confessed this in private, and said, "The law has been restored now that I have had my way."

And yet the legal adviser might do much toward mending legislative matters. Early printing of the bill would also be a help; and the counting of members instead of the calling of the roll would give more time to discuss the merits of the bill.

The new member, and many an old one too, thinks that he must introduce about so many bills or else his constituents will think he has made no "record." Hence the number is the measure of his work, no matter how crude or injurious they may be. Here is the golden harvest of the demagogue; and he is not always the labor agitator by any means. He takes one side or the other of such questions as the new Capitol, the civil code, freedom of worship, woman suffrage, and even the charters of cities. Such demagogues, once discovered, should be left at home; but faithful and tried legislators should be returned—men who will not rise and inanely state that they believe a bill to be unconstitutional, but that they will violate their oath and vote for it because they think the Governor will veto it.

The simplest and the surest way to avoid the shams of legislation is to send a better class of men to the Capitol; to put none but representative men on guard, and to retire the political tricksters to their dens. This will not happen till public sentiment is thoroughly aroused, and the stay-at-home citizens rally at the caucuses and the polls. The fountain will not rise higher than its source; nor must the well-wishing citizen be surprised if his continued inactivity continues to produce the same results in legislative halls and on the statute-books.

THE ENLISTMENT OF LAFAYETTE, 1776.

HISTORY records no more remarkable alliance than that commemorated by the erection of the great monument in New York harbor. From the most despotic government men came to aid the most free. The people among whom ancient institutions had been preserved in the greatest integrity joined forces with the people who had discarded tradition and begun their national life afresh. The Frenchmen fought for America, and returned home—but not the same. They had seen in every sense a New World, and they carried back ideas which were to have no small effect on the great convulsion which awaited them in their own country. One among them will always be especially interesting to us, because of the enthusiasm, self-sacrifice, and generosity which brought him to our shores and made him throughout his life so faithful a friend to America.

Toward the close of the year 1776, the Duke of Gloucester, brother of George III., in the course of his travels arrived at the town of Metz, in France. The old Comte de Broglie, distinguished in the Seven Years' War, was stationed there in command of the garrison, and he invited some of his officers, passing the required term of service far from the pleasures of Versailles and Paris, to meet the royal visitor at dinner. The duke himself was something of a rebel, being at that time in banishment for having defied the authority of his brother by marrying the Countess of Waldegrave. He had lately received news from England regarding the conduct of some of his Majesty's colonies in America, and naturally made it the subject of conversation at the dinner-table. He related how these colonies had resisted various paternal injunctions of the home Government, had declined to be taxed, had driven the British soldiers ignominiously out of a town called Boston, and had even gone so far as to declare their independence of his Majesty altogether. Such a relation, by a brother of George III., to officers belonging to the proudest aristocracy and subjects of the most absolute sovereign in Europe, would seem to have deserved no other notice than the hope that the rebellious *canaille* would be

sufficiently punished. But nothing can illustrate more significantly the dangerous condition of France at this period, when the mutterings of angry discontent with arbitrary power were audible in every class, from the starving peasantry to the spendthrift court, than the interest and sympathy excited by this account of a distant people struggling for their political rights. One of these officers had been listening with particular attention. He was just nineteen years old, tall and thin, with a long nose, retreating forehead, and reddish hair; his solemn expression of countenance and rather awkward manner contrasting with the frivolous grace of other young men of his rank and age. He was a marquis, of long and noble descent, connected by marriage with a family reputed to be the greatest at the Court of France, and having at his own disposal an income of more than $30,000 a year. He listened intently to all that was said; his grave face grew animated as his eager questions were answered; and he rose from the table resolved to abandon the pleasures which rank and wealth had to bestow in the gayest court and capital of the world, to leave even the young wife who had given him one child and was soon to give him another, that he might risk life and fortune in the cause of the threatened people of whom his French schooling had probably not even taught him the existence. In his own words: "When first I heard of American independence my heart was enlisted!"

From the account given by the Duke of Gloucester it is not likely that the true merits of the case were exposed, nor was the French mind prepared to appreciate the practical simplicity of the points in dispute. But one idea was plain enough: the insurgents were fighting for liberty; and this word, so seldom in the mouths of those who possess the benefits it represents, is sufficient to rouse the deepest feelings of men who daily feel the hand of oppression. Not only in Paris, but throughout France and in the principal cities of Europe, arose a spontaneous cry of sympathetic approval at the news that an oppressed people were rebelling against their sovereign. The courage of the insurgents, or Bostonians, as they were called, was lauded to the skies by men who longed but feared to follow their example. The young Comte de Ségur wrote that the first cannon-shot fired in America in defence of freedom resounded throughout Europe with the rapidity of lightning. At Spa, where were gathered many travellers—voluntary delegates, as Ségur called them, from all the monarchies of Europe—all were unanimous in

admiration of the men who had dared to resist tyranny. The fashionable game of whist had to give way to another called Boston. In Paris the news awakened violent emotions. Idle nobles and officers saw an opportunity for military service and glory; statesmen an opportunity to humiliate England and wipe out the disgrace of the last peace; and the people in general, suffering under the accumulated abuses of generations of arbitrary and corrupt government, welcomed, in the example of America, a proof that tyranny, ruinous taxation, and oppression need not endure forever. These feelings took the form of devoted attentions to Franklin and the other American envoys, of loud applause, at the theatres, of every passage which referred to liberty or resistance, of animated discussions of the rightful functions of Government. The fever took possession of the highest ranks of society, making American affairs the principal subject of conversation, introducing Franklin medallions, snuff-boxes, and fans even into the Palace of Versailles. Mme. du Deffand, writing to Walpole, D'Alembert to Frederick the Great, declared that the American insurgents occupied the attention of the philosophical and intelligent world.

Of the powerful sentiments which resulted in the French alliance, Lafayette's early and brilliant efforts made him the exponent. He was by no means a young man from whom great things were expected, nor was he known to possess other advantage than those of wealth and influential connections at court. His family was ancient and distinguished. There had been the Marshal de Lafayette, who won the battle of Beaugé in 1421, and prevented Henry V. of England from taking entire possession of France; the beautiful and virtuous Mlle. de Lafayette, who had stood in the way of Cardinal Richelieu's complete ascendency over Louis XIII.; and that Mme. de Lafayette, the friend of La Rochefoucauld, who wrote

> "Des romans à Paris,
> Avec les beaux esprits,"

and began the modern novel of real life. The father of our Lafayette was killed at the battle of Minden, in July, 1757. Although only twenty-four years old, he had already distinguished himself, was Colonel of the Grenadiers of France and Chevalier of St. Louis. It is believed that his death was caused by a cannon-shot from a battery commanded by the same General Philips against whom his son fought in Virginia in 1781. He was a poor man, but had made

up for that by marrying the daughter of the Marquis de Rivière, from whom his son inherited the fortune which he used so well. Hardly a month had elapsed after the young colonel's death at Minden, when, on the 6th of September, 1757, at the Chateau of Chavaniac, his wife's home in Auvergne, was born his only child, who received the name of Marie Paul Joseph Roche Ives Gilbert de Motier.

According to the intelligent game-laws of France, wild animals were allowed to roam everywhere with impunity, and Lafayette's earliest recollection, when about eight years old, was the hope of encountering in his walks a wolf which had committed depredations in the neighborhood. In his twelfth year he was sent to the Collége du Plessis, at Paris, and while there the death of his mother and grandfather placed him in possession of a large fortune. He learned little enough at this college, but still acquired what was necessary for every French nobleman, a capacity to write his own language well. It is characteristic of him that, when directed to compose an essay on the horse, he took care to insist on the disposition of that animal to throw a too-exacting rider. Lafayette was soon transferred from the Collége du Plessis to the Academy at Versailles, and made an officer in the Mousquetaires Noirs, the reviews of which took him from the school-boy's bench to command men, and at sixteen a wife was provided for him.

The family of Noailles was of such rank and consequence at court that when Marie Antoinette's intimacy with Mme. de Polignac raised the latter to the most prominent position, the Comtesse de Noailles found it necessary to resign her charge, as it was impossible for her to occupy any but the first place. Mlle. Marie Adrienne, granddaughter of the Duc de Noailles and daughter of the Duc d'Ayen, was married to Lafayette in April, 1774, when fourteen years of age. The young people were hardly consulted in the matter; they were of about equal rank, age, and wealth, and these were reasons sufficient for a union which, fortunately, proved a blessing to both. At the same time George III. signed the Boston Port Bill, thus making the American war inevitable.

Lafayette's marriage afforded him an intimate introduction at court, where the young bridegroom of sixteen had an opportunity of studying royalty in the person of Louis XV., and the social virtues in that of Mme. du Barry, whose amiable desire it was to make every woman who hoped for a heaven hereafter to experience a hell

on earth. Lafayette was present at the Du Barry's when the king had the fainting-fit which announced his fatal disease. With the advent to the throne of Louis XVI., in 1774, the court was disinfected and its tone considerably raised. But the general standard of morality among the aristocracy remained much the same, and if Lafayette's life showed an observance of domestic duties it was, like his other good qualities, in spite of his education and early influences. Marie Antoinette, in the zenith of her young beauty and happiness, retained much simplicity of character, and longed to withdraw from conventional grandeur to taste the satisfactions of private life. She gathered together a select party of young people, for the purpose of acting plays and dancing quadrilles in fancy costume. Among these were included Lafayette and Ségur. The company chose dresses imitated from those of feudal times, and sought to invest themselves with the character of knights and ladies of chivalry. The quadrilles and the rehearsals necessary for them became the favorite amusement of the queen's household, and excited untold jealousy among the uninitiated. The older courtiers, anxious to keep up ancient ceremonies in unimpaired rigidity, and fearing the influence of this new intimacy, made every effort to break up the quadrilles. Their anxiety was greatly increased when the dancers induced the king to publish an order compelling all persons who attended the queen's ball to appear in similar costumes, for Ségur says, with a touch of malice, that although very becoming to youthful and slender figures, they were ridiculous for stout or elderly persons. The contest between ceremony and pleasure resulted finally in favor of the former, and the quadrilles, with their fancy costumes and cherished intimacy, came to an end. With them ceased Lafayette's frequent appearances at court. The inborn independence of his nature stiffened the hinges of his knee. The serious bent of his mind unfitted him for the endless flow of frivolous small-talk which was necessary to popularity. He himself has said that he was silent in company because the things he thought or heard did not seem to him worth saying, and that he could neither unbend sufficiently for the graces of the court nor for the liveliness of a supper in town. As time passed he grew more averse to Versailles and more fond of being with his regiment. When the Noailles family undertook to procure for him a place about the person of the Duc de Provence, he secretly resolved to defeat the project. He seized the opportunity presented by a masked ball, accosted the duke, allowed himself to be

recognized, and expressed liberal sentiments highly repugnant to his hearer. When the prince informed him sharply that he would remember the interview, Lafayette replied that memory was the wit of fools. This remark, of course, settled the question of employment at court, and the Duc de Provence, even when Louis XVIII., retained the animosity aroused by this scene. The family of Noailles, which Lafayette had adopted, and loved as his own, could not understand the young man's character. His reserve and independence were the very opposite of the qualities which his courtly relatives wished to see in him. His young friend Ségur was much better informed, as the following extract will show: "At every period of his life, and, above all, in his youth, Lafayette displayed a cold and grave exterior which sometimes gave to his demeanor an air of timidity and embarrassment which did not really belong to him. His reserved manners and his silent disposition presented a singular contrast to the petulance, the levity, and the ostentatious loquacity of persons of his own age; but, under this exterior, to all appearance so phlegmatic, he concealed the most active mind, the most determined character, and the most enthusiastic spirit. Of this fact I was better enabled to judge than others. During the preceding winter he had become attached to a lady as amiable as she was beautiful, and having erroneously conceived an idea that I was his rival, in a fit of jealousy he had put aside all consideration of our friendship and had passed the greater part of the night with me, endeavoring to prevail on me to decide by the sword which of us should be the favored suitor of a lady to whom I made no pretensions. Some days after our quarrel and reconciliation, I could not refrain from laughing when I heard the Marshal de Noailles and other individuals of his family entreat me to use my influence with him to animate his torpidity, to rouse him from his inaction, and to communicate some animation to his character. It is easy to conceive their astonishment when they learned suddenly that this young sage of nineteen, so cool and so indifferent, had been so far carried away by the love of glory and of danger as to intend to cross the ocean and fight in the cause of American freedom."

Lafayette lost no time in putting into execution the resolution which he had taken at Metz. On his arrival in Paris, he soon concluded, from various slight indications, that nothing but opposition was to be expected from his family, and that he must depend entirely upon himself. To strengthen his purpose, to provide an

answer to his own misgivings and discouragements, he adopted the motto *Cur non?* The first business was to form an acquaintance with the American agents. Silas Deane was officially ignored by the French Government, which was endeavoring to keep up appearances with England; but he was secretly despatching arms and accoutrements to America, with the connivance of the Ministers and the help of the celebrated Beaumarchais, whose claims for repayment were destined to cause so painful a dispute with the United States. Deane was so closely watched by the spies of Lord Stormont, the English Ambassador, who was kept informed of all proceedings by the treacherous Bancroft, that it was exceedingly difficult to see him without exciting suspicion. Lafayette's first action, therefore, was to make acquaintance with De Kalb, an officer of German origin, whom Choiseul had sent to America some years before, to report on the prospects of profitable French interference. De Kalb, himself, was arranging to go to the colonies; he introduced Lafayette to Deane, and interpreted the short conversation which took place. Lafayette realized that his boyish countenance and inexperience were not strong recommendations; he therefore made a great point of his zeal in the cause, and of the sensation that his departure would undoubtedly make.

Deane was glad enough to meet this new ally; he signed an agreement by which the young recruit should have the rank of major-general in the United States, and should be conveyed thither in a vessel about to be despatched with munitions of war. Franklin and Lee soon after joined Deane as commissioners. But they were all so closely watched that it was only safe to communicate with them through Carmichael, an American then living in Paris. Secrecy was so important for Lafayette that he hardly knew where to look for necessary assistance. An application to the Marshal de Broglie met with strenuous opposition. The old soldier could see nothing but danger in the project. In several interviews he urged that the cause itself was doubtful, that the success of the colonies was very unlikely, that Lafayette was risking his own life and fortune, the peace of his family and connections, without a prospect of reward. "I have seen your uncle die in the wars of Italy, I have witnessed your father's death at Minden, and I will not be accessary to the ruin of the last remaining branch of the family." But, in response to the most urgent requests, he promised not to betray the plan he could not approve, and even indicated some officers who might be of service.

Lafayette then confided his intentions to his brother-in-law, the Vicomte de Noailles, and to his uncle by marriage, the Vicomte de Ségur, son of the Ségur who soon afterward became Minister of War. To his great joy, they received his proposals with enthusiasm, and all three entered into an agreement of secrecy until the disposition of the Government could be ascertained and the arrangements for departure completed. But the secret was too glorious to be kept long. They endeavored to enlist the interest of some other young men, through whose indiscretion the affair came to the ears of the court, and an explosion of astonishment and disapprobation immediately followed. The Ministers feared that the departure as volunteers of noblemen of such rank would be interpreted by the English Government as an open acknowledgment of the intention of France to support the colonies. Formal orders were at once issued to the young men to abandon their enterprise, while their families warmly reproached them for their folly and rashness. Ségur and Noailles, being dependent on their parents, were compelled reluctantly to acquiesce. Lafayette, conscious of his independence, was only irritated by opposition. He outwardly appeared to yield, but secretly determined that nothing should keep him from America. *Cur non?* At this juncture came another severe discouragement. News arrived that Washington had been defeated at Long Island and was now retreating through New Jersey, with a ragged and suffering army of 3,000 men, before Howe's victorious and well-accoutred troops. The credit of the colonies immediately fell; the cause seemed to the French too hopeless to be worth aiding, and it became impossible to send the vessel. The American Commissioners honestly informed Lafayette of the state of affairs, and discouraged his perseverance. But, in this hour of adversity, Lafayette's unselfish devotion to what he believed a noble cause overcame every obstacle. Thanking Deane for his frankness, he said: "Until this moment, sir, you have seen only my zeal; now, perhaps, I may become really useful. I shall purchase a vessel myself to carry your officers. We must show our confidence in the cause, and it is in the time of your danger that I wish to share your fortunes." The old people were not unjustified in their accusations of rashness and folly. Franklin, through Carmichael, assented gladly to this new proposal. But it was extremely difficult to procure a vessel without discovery by Lord Stormont. Fortunately, when the Comte de Broglie saw that Lafayette's resolution was irrevocable, he lent a surreptitious assistance. M. du Bois-

martin, the count's secretary, was despatched to Bordeaux, and there secured a ship. Repairs, however, were necessary, and some time must elapse before departure could be thought of. Meanwhile the secret must be kept. It happened opportunely that Lafayette had a long-standing engagement with his cousin, the Prince de Poix, to take a journey to England. To fulfil this engagement was evidently the best way to disarm suspicion and pass the time until the vessel could be made ready. The two friends set out for London, where Lafayette's uncle, the Marquis de Noailles, was ambassador, and on their arrival were treated with great distinction. It was the cue of the English Government to keep up the appearance of undiminished friendship with France, and the arrival of the young strangers afforded a favorable opportunity for a demonstration of affection. Lafayette has recorded his feelings of amusement on being presented to his Britannic Majesty, against whom he was soon to be in arms; how he enjoyed dancing at the house of Lord George Germain, the secretary for the colonies, in company with Lord Rawdon, lately arrived from New York. At the opera he met Clinton, whom he was next to encounter at the Battle of Monmouth. His open expressions of sympathy with the rebels procured him an invitation to breakfast at Lord Shelburne's. He has been accused by English writers of making use of his visit to obtain information, but he declined an invitation given by King George himself, to see the military preparations then making at Portsmouth, and avoided every action which could be construed into a breach of confidence. When three weeks had passed amidst the gayeties of London, Lafayette could endure the delay no longer, and resolved to return to France and join his vessel. He told his uncle, the ambassador, that he had taken a fancy to cross the Channel for a few days' visit at home. The latter opposed the idea strongly, on the ground that so abrupt a departure would be disrespectful to the English Court. But, as Lafayette persisted, the Marquis de Noailles offered to give out that his nephew was sick, until his return. "I would not have proposed this stratagem," said Lafayette, "but I did not object to it."

After suffering severely from sea-sickness in the Channel, Lafayette arrived at De Kalb's house in Paris, and proceeded thence to Chaillot, where he had his final interview with the American Commissioners, and gave his directions to the officers who were to accompany him. So far no suspicions were entertained by his family or at

court that the project was still on foot. One morning, two months after the prohibition had been issued which discontinued the conferences of himself, Ségur, and Noailles, Lafayette entered Ségur's room in Paris at seven o'clock, in haste, carefully closed the door behind him, seated himself at Ségur's bedside, and said: "I am going to America. No one knows it. But I love you too well to set off without intrusting you with the secret." "And how have you been able," inquired Ségur, "to secure your passage?" The story was soon told, and Ségur congratulated his friend on the success which he so much longed to share.

Lafayette had hardly set out for Bordeaux when his departure became known to Lord Stormont, who immediately informed the Noailles family and the Ministers. On arriving at the seaport he found that the vessel was not yet ready. Soon after, on receiving an intimation that the court was fully informed of his proceedings, he suspended the repairs and set sail immediately for Passage, a neighboring port in Spain. There he was met by two officers who had followed by land from Bordeaux, bearing a peremptory *lettre de cachet*, which forbade him under the severest penalties to go to America, and commanded him to repair at once to Marseilles and there await further orders. The messengers also brought family letters which Lafayette himself described as terrible. They pointed out the certain consequences which might be expected from the power and the anger of the Government, which would construe the departure of a military officer as treason. But what troubled Lafayette most was the undisguised displeasure of relations and friends, and, above all, the thought of his wife and her condition. The Noailles projected a tour in Italy, and insisted that Lafayette should join them at Marseilles and accompany them. But he felt that it was too late to withdraw. In obedience to the *lettre de cachet*, he left the vessel in safety at Passage, accompanied the king's officers back to Bordeaux, and reported to the commandant there. Then he despatched letters to Paris, in the vain hope of bringing about a change of sentiment. To his family he urged the worthiness of the cause in which he was engaged, and begged their support. To the Ministers he justified his position, mentioning as precedents an Irish officer in the king's service who had lately joined the British forces in America, and the case of Duportail and two other French engineers who had obtained permission to enter the American service. In one of his letters he let fall the remark that the Ministers could

talk with better grace of the sanctity of his oath of allegiance when they began to observe their own pledges, a statement which was duly reported to the Government, and was too true not to excite anger. In this case, as in the interview with the Duc de Provence, Lafayette's contempt for royalty and for the Ministry shows how little respect was felt for either by men who were familiar with them. A special courier carried a letter for De Cogny, an intimate friend of Lafayette's, requesting him to ascertain as soon as possible whether there was any chance that the Government would yield. The courier returned immediately with De Cogny's reply, which was that the court was much incensed, and that there was not the remotest possibility that permission to sail would be granted. But one hope remained: to cross the Spanish border and embark before the royal messengers could arrive to arrest him. To Maurepas, the drivelling old Prime Minister, he wrote contemptuously that, receiving no reply to his letters, he took the Government's silence to imply a tacit consent. Then, allowing the commandant at Bordeaux to believe that he was about to obey orders by repairing to Marseilles, he set out on the route to that city in a post-chaise, accompanied by an officer named De Mauroy, who was anxious to go to America. As soon as the carriage reached the open country, Lafayette disguised himself as a courier, and in that capacity galloped on ahead and ordered the relays. Leaving the Marseilles road, the party arrived at Bayonne, where occurred a delay of three hours. During this time Lafayette lay on the straw in the stable, in his disguise as courier. He was now pursuing the same route that he had lately passed over on his way from Passage to Bordeaux, in company with the royal officers, and there was danger of recognition. At a little village called St. Jean de Luz this actually happened, and nearly proved fatal to the enterprise. As the pretended courier rode into the post-yard, and called for horses, he was recognized by the innkeeper's daughter as a young gentleman whom she had seen driven by in a carriage but a few days before. Her surprise was evident, but a sign from Lafayette made her understand that secrecy was desired. She required no more to remain faithful to the stranger. Soon after, when the officers in pursuit rode up and inquired if such a carriage had passed, she replied that she had seen a carriage, but it contained no such persons as were described. The baffled pursuers returned, and Lafayette arrived at Passage without further accident. After six months of constant effort, discouragement, and anxiety, he stood at

last on the deck of the ship which his enthusiastic hope had christened *La Victoire*, and gave the order to set sail.

The effect produced by the departure of Lafayette was of great political importance. The Government, of course, was extremely angry at the disregard of its positive commands, and despatched vessels to intercept the fugitive at the West India Islands. The Noailles family, with the exception of Lafayette's wife, did not conceal their indignation, regarding the whole proceeding as foolish in the extreme, and fearing the effects of the Government's vengeance. Many of the nobility shared their feelings. "All Paris," wrote the Chevalier de Marais to his mother, "is discussing the adventure of a young courtier, the son-in-law of Noailles, who has a pretty wife, two children, 50,000 crowns a year—in fact, everything which can make life here agreeable and dear, but who deserted all that a week ago to join the insurgents. His name is M. de Lafayette." And the marquise replied, from her chateau in the country: "What new kind of folly is this, my dear child? What! the madness of knight-errantry still exists! It has disciples! Go to help the insurgents! I am delighted that you reassure me about yourself, for I should tremble for you; but since you see that M. de Lafayette is a madman, I am tranquil. How I pity his mother!" But very different were the feelings of many young and ardent nobles, who sympathized with the American cause, and wished themselves on *La Victoire*. By the general public the news was received with enthusiasm. The universal desire was that France should aid the colonies, and Lafayette's departure was taken as a good augury. It was well known that no member of the Noailles family undertook anything of importance without the sanction of a family consultation, and it was difficult to believe that Lafayette had acted independently. The coffee-houses echoed with the young lieutenant's name, and at the theatres no passage was allowed to pass unnoticed which could be made to apply to the favorite subject. Mme. du Deffand wrote to Horace Walpole: "Of course it is a piece of folly, but it does him no discredit. He receives more praise than blame." Walpole and Gibbon recorded the circumstances in their journals, and took it for granted, in common with most of their countrymen, that the French Government's opposition was feigned. To the American cause the event was of real utility. It afforded an opportunity for the public opinion of France to declare itself in favor of an alliance, and excited a lively spirit of emulation among military men.

As *La Victoire* spread her sails to the wind, Franklin despatched the following communication to the American Congress: "The Marquis de Lafayette, a young nobleman of great family connections here and great wealth, is gone to America in a ship of his own, accompanied by some officers of distinction, in order to serve in our armies. He is exceedingly beloved, and everybody's good wishes attend him. We cannot but hope he may meet with such a reception as will make the country and his expedition agreeable to him. Those who censure it, as imprudent in him, do nevertheless applaud his spirit: and we are satisfied that the civilities and respect that may be shown him will be serviceable to our affairs here, as pleasing not only to his powerful relations and to the court, but to the whole French nation. He has left a beautiful young wife, and, for her sake particularly, we hope that his bravery and ardent desire to distinguish himself will be a little restrained by the general's prudence, so as not to permit his being hazarded much, except on some important occasion."

BAYARD TUCKERMAN.

MADAME LAREVEILLÈRE.

THE autumn was struggling for recognition, and was making an impression upon all but the mid-day hours. In the mornings, the air came cool and crisp, full of incentives to work. In the evenings, the soft languor and dreamy inertness had been driven away by a wide-awake activity, good resolutions and plans of future energy to be discussed inside closed doors and windows into late hours of the night. The roses in the garden bloomed pale and listless after their exhausting summer season, shivering perfumelessly in the practical October breezes. The trees were in the full glory of their rich, green foliage. The cane in the fields stood in thick, solid maturity, its long, green pendent leaves curling over and over in bewildering luxuriance. The sunset clouds, bursting with light and color, gilded the tops of the boundary woods and illumined like a halo the familiar features of plantation life. The Mississippi river, reflecting and rivalling the sky above, rolled, an iridescent current, between its yellow mud banks cut into grotesque silhouettes by crevasses and steamboat landings as it dimpled in eddies over shallows, boiled and swirled in hollow whirlpools over depths, or rushed with inflexible, relentless rapidity, following the channel in its angular course from point to point.

The day's work had come to an end; the plantation bell rang out its dismissal and benediction. The blacksmith laid down the half-sharpened cane-knife and commenced covering up the fire. From mysterious openings on all sides of the sugar-house workmen issued with tools in their hands. The stable doors were thrown open and the hostlers, old crooked-legged negroes, hurried about with food for the mules. The cows tinkled their impatient bells outside the milking lot, while the frantic calves bounded and bleated inside. From the two long rows of whitewashed cabins in the quarters the smoke began to rise. The drowsy young women, sitting with their babies on the cabin steps, shifted their positions, and raised their apathetic eyes from the eager faces pressing against their bosoms to the heavens above for ocular confirmation of the bell, and turned their ears toward the home-coming road from the

fields. The exempt old women, the house dragons, wrinkled, withered, decrepit, deformed, with all but life used out of them, hobbled around in a fictitious bustle, picking up chips, filling buckets of water at the cistern, or standing with their hands pressed against their bent backs to send blood-curdling threats and promises after the children.

Along the smooth yellow road through the field came the "gang," with their mules and wagons, ploughs and hoes. In advance walked the women, swaying themselves from side to side with characteristic abandon, lighting their rude pipes, hailing the truce to toil with loud volubility. Against the luminous evening sky their black profiles came out with startling distinctness, showing features just sharpening into regularity from cartilaginous formlessness, the gleam of white teeth, and the gaudy colors of the cotton kerchiefs knotted across their brows. Their bodies, as though vaguely recalling ancestral nudity amid tropical forests, seemed to defy concealment, throwing out bold curves and showing lines of savage grace through the scant folds of their loose-fitting garments. Sylvan secrets seemed still to hang around them. In their soft sad eyes, not yet cleared and brightened by sophistication, spoke the untamed desires of wild, free nature; while fitfully, in the opaque depths shone bright gleams, as of a struggling intelligence, pathetic appeals as from an imprisoned spirit protesting against foul, Circean enchantment. The men followed, aggressively masculine, heavy-limbed, slow of movement with their hampered shod feet; wearing their clothes like harness; with unhandsome, chaotic faces, small eyes and concealed natures. They watched the women with jealous interest, excluding them from their hilarity, and responding grudgingly and depreciatingly to their frank overtures. The water-carriers, half-grown boys and girls, idled at a distanee, balancing their empty pails on their bare heads. Quick and light on their feet, graceful, alert, intuitive, exuberant with life and animal spirits, happy in the thoughtless, unconscious enjoyment of the short moment that yet separated them from their hot, dull, heavy, dangerous maturity.

The anticipations of cheer and rest, the subtle satisfaction of honestly tired bodies, the flattering commendations of their own skill from the finely cultivated stand of cane on each side of them, the past expiations of ploughing, ditching, weeding, hoeing; the freezing rains, the scorching suns, but, above all, the approach of the grinding season, the "Roulaison," with its frolics, excitements, and

good pay, all tended to elate their spirits; and their voices in joke, song, laugh, and retort sped down the road before them to the quarters, and evoked responsive barks and shouts from the dogs and children there.

It was the busy time of the year, and the anxious time too: the roulaison. It was the period to which the rest of the year led up, the chronological terminus of calculation and cultivation; when the fields with their accumulated interest of labor and capital were delivered over for judgment to the sugar-house. Always dominating the place, the material importance of the sugar-house became tyrannical, oppressive, as cane-cutting approached. It reared itself, an ugly, square, red-brick structure, menacingly before the fields; it dwarfed the "big house" into insignificance, and, with its vast shed, divided by the cane-carrier, its chimneys, furnaces, boiler, bagasse-heaps, its mountainous wood-pile and barricade of new hogsheads, it shut out the view of the river from the quarters, and consigned the latter to a species of seclusion. What its verdict would be, was now the one item of interest to all, from the oldest gray-beard to the youngest thinker on "Bel Angely" plantation. What the sugar-house decided, fixed the good or bad character of the past year, and approved or disproved the executive ability of the plantation manager. It is a close contest between man and nature, and the always increasing science of the one is more than counterbalanced by the capricious obstinacy of the other. The old men and women, heir-looms of departed experiences, found themselves growing in importance with autumn, and their rusty memories became oracles to furnish data for prognostication. There were the "big freeze" and the "early freeze" and the "late freeze" years. There were years when the cane sprouted in the mats, when the second-year stubble could not be told from first year, and the first-year stubble filled up like plant cane. Then there were all the years marked by a water-line of rises, overflows, and crevasses. There was one memory that contained a year in which the Mississippi froze all over, and several that perpetuated the falling of the stars; but however persistently such a recurrence was periodically suggested, nature had been pleased to withhold a repetition. The autocratic sugar-house itself was not beyond damaging recollections: it might have been a natural product for the number of hitches and breaks with which it managed to vary its runs, and the success with which it eluded its yearly examiners and tinkers. Then, there was the sacharo-

meter to disparage the splendid growth of the cane, the polariscope to contradict the sacharometer, and, finally, the commission merchant to give the lie to nature and man; with high charges and low prices to enjoin all hopes, reverse all calculations, and not only damn the past but confound the future. No roulaison ever came exactly like a preceding one, and no season ever duplicated its calamities; but never had roulaison come with such guarantee of success to be met with so unforeseen a mishap as the illness of Monsieur Félix—ill in bed of sciatica!

In the great ledger, commenced by the first sugar-making Angely down to day before yesterday, never had such an item been recorded. It was like the illness of a commander just before battle. And such a commander as Monsieur Félix was! not trusting the sun to shine or the cane to grow in his absence. His ever-watchful eye and unwearied sagacity pervading the plantation from limit to limit; so omniscient and self-reliant, that if there were one place on the perverse globe that could dispense with supernal jurisdiction, one place that could be safely trusted to earthly viceregency, that place was Bel Angely plantation, Parish of St. Charles. He had had his bed pulled close to the window, and any hour of the day, from dawn to dark, his bright red face, with its fierce gray moustache, could be seen looking out, and his excited voice heard screaming, scolding, expostulating, and threatening, until even the pet chickens and ducks deserted their favorite feeding-place, and the little, crawling black children, with their skirts tied up under their arms, learned to imitate their elders and crept nimbly under the gallery or dodged behind the out-houses to avoid him. If the door of his bedchamber were inadvertently left open but a second, little gusts of passion would escape down the hall, blasting, like tiny siroccos, the healthful calm and good-humor outside. Mademoiselle Aurore herself, with all her natural and cultivated conscientiousness, had to feign deafness in order to secure necessary leisure for housekeeping directions.

"*Ah, mon Dieu! les hommes! les hommes!*" was all she could exclaim to her own and the interrogatories of others. She knew by experience that weather contingencies and constitutional irregularities were always to be visited on the females of the house; she did not repine at things she was inured to or rebel against a manifest design of Providence; but that wretched Gabi!

No wonder she was nearly distracted and completely unable, as heretofore, to extract good omens from patent misfortunes. Her

life had been counted by roulaisons, as some women's are by springs, and she felt as if this one were going to put her, with the cane in the fields, between the great revolving grinders of the mill. There was always enough to be done—enough impatience and vexation to contend with naturally. If Gabi could only have acquitted himself properly! If Félix could only have gotten ill at some other time! If she could only be allowed to take the sciatica as a physical instead of a mental burden! She had done everything as a sister and a Christian to relieve the tension of affairs. She had placed herself at the disposition of every functionary on the place—sugar-maker, cooper, engineer, blacksmith—and was at the beck and call of every "hand" coming for food, medicine, advice, or instruction. She had entered into negotiations with every saint in the calendar amenable to representations on the subject of sugar or sciatica. Her room fairly blazed with temporary shrines, and candles which her own private little requisitions had kept for years in a state of perpetual incandescence; by a *coup-d'état* she transferred them all from her own account to that of the plantation and her brother. She was in constant communication with the parish priest, although he was a rough, vulgar Gascon whom she detested. In fact, she had expended vows and promises so recklessly that, were but half her prayers granted, she could look forward to none but a future of religious insolvency if not bankruptcy. But Gabi! that was an entirely superfluous complication.

As usual she had been too zealous. To save the labor of a man, at so critical a time, and to extort tardy appreciation of her protégé, a twelve-year-old negro boy, she had taken it upon herself to send him for the mail. She had often wished to send him before, his trustworthiness being a matter of dispute between her and her brother, but Félix had always peremptorily refused. He was prejudiced against Gabi, and there was no arguing away his prejudices; but his illness afforded a timely opportunity of destroying them. *Hélas!*

She stood by the door of the chamber, in which not one but a dozen sciaticas appeared to be unleashed, holding in her hands the mail-bag. Not the one she had given Gabi with so many careful instructions in the gray light of the morning; that one had been dropped and dropped in the dust and mud, in the road and ditches; and, finally, when Gabi had concluded to take his rest unbroken in the shade of a tree instead of in fractional naps on the mule's back,

the swine had come along, and with ruthless tusks had reduced the contents to a shapeless mass. She had extracted one crumpled, soiled, foul letter from the débris, and put it in the new, clean, alternate bag; one letter! when at this season Felix was corresponding with every other man in New Orleans! And Gabi had made such a good first communion last spring, and never, never missed church! The mule, too, had wandered away, St. Anthony alone knew where; Gabi was in her cabinet now, hiding from Edmond, who was searching for him with a whip. She could keep it from Félix until he got well; but then, of course, she must tell him.

When she came out of the room a half-hour later she was enveloped in a bitter condemnation of post-mistresses and neglectful correspondents, and pursued by a last rush of important commissions.

"Send Edmond to me. Tell Joe to get ready to take the next boat to the city. I thought you were going to hunt up that roll of wire in the store-room. Hasn't old Sîmon sent yet? Don't forget to copy Smith's estimate. Go to the sugar-house—no; I shall tell Duval myself to go to the devil with his charges. Don't forget about the lamp-wicks and the towels for the sugar-house, and . . . oh, yes, tell Stasie to fetch me some ink; it is very strange that the inkstand is never filled unless I see about it myself,—and Aurore!"

"Yes, Féfé."

"The key of the medicine chest!"

"*Misère! misère!*" She held her hands to her head, trying to sort them out. She made a motion toward the sugar-house, but changed it to the direction of the store-room. She remembered the medicine-chest key and felt for the key-basket on her arm; it was not there; she wondered where it could be, and started toward her chamber in search of it, when she caught a glimpse of Madame Lareveillère on the gallery. Then the reproach came to her that she had not yet wished her friend good-evening.

"*Bon-soir*, Eugénie."

"*Bon-soir*, Aurore."

"*Ma chère*, I feel like a pagan leaving you so much alone, but Féfé, you cannot imagine what he is! What makes men such devils when they are sick? If Féfé would only be sensible and have a physician and get well, but no, he and Stasie think they can cure anything. Physician! he would as soon see a priest, and priests

are his bêtes-noires. How can an intelligent man be so prejudiced? But it is the way he was educated; that comes of sending boys to France to be educated; that is the teaching of Messieurs Voltaire and Rousseau. Oh, I compliment them!"

Her irony was mordant. She came out of the door-way and seated herself upon the top step of the staircase that wound its way to the basement underneath. "And Gabi! ah, that is too much! Fancy, Eugénie, after all the trouble I took to explain to him this morning, he brings the mail-bag devoured by hogs; all the letters a disgusting mass. Only one could I extricate entire for Féfé. I don't speak of your letters . . ."

"Oh, you know very well I never get letters from any one but Madame Joubert; always the same school news. The swine are welcome."

"I wish Féfé were so reasonable. He will be furious, both about the letters and the mule. And he will say—you know what reason he will give for it all?—religion; too much mass. He will say he expected it before, and I shall never hear the end of it. Now we, because Gabi was pious, and really, Eugénie, at times in church I have watched him, he had moments of genuine fervor—we would say that his religion was a reason why he should bring the mail well and be a good servant; but not Féfé, he is so prejudiced. It prevents everything."

Mademoiselle Aurore sighed and looked down the avenue to the river, her thoughts sadly enumerating the calculations and hopes blighted by Gabi's recalcitrance. Her thin regular features and sallow complexion showed the exhaustive harassment of the past two days.

She and Madame Lareveillère had been to school together, were *amies de cœur* and *toute dévouées* on every class book from the *abécédaire* up to the *Histoire de France*, and their confidences had followed the uninterrupted growth of their hearts from dolls to sentiments. There was a time when their hearts had been as bare to each other as their faces, but that was long, long ago. Time, age, or self-consciousness had since draped and obscured them one from the other. The abundant stream of their confessions was being reduced to a clear, cool surface-rill of generalities. One could only guess at the changes that must have taken place in the other, or try to compute them by covert observation, furtive soundings, and silent criticism. Habit now continued the links that bound them, and prolonged

the intimacy inaugurated by impulse. They were together this summer after a longer period of separation than usual.

Madame sighed with Mademoiselle Aurore, but her sympathetic look was accompanied with the private reflection: "Heavens! what a difference a man makes in a woman's looks—that is, of course, a man who is not a brother—poor Aurore!" At school Aurore's relations with her sex had been as close as possible, she was *la plus femme des femmes.* Now, economical nature seemed stealthily recalling one by one charms which had proved a useless, unprofitable investment; flattening her chest, straightening her curves, prosaicising her eyes, diluting her voice; in short, despoiling the handmaiden of Saint Catherine almost beyond the recognition of her dearest friend. The little heart that once bounded so frankly forward toward orange blossoms was being led by religion now, away from mirrors, adornments, fripperies, and follies of the flesh, away from Madame Lareveillère, away from herself, down an austere path rugged with artificial vicissitudes, where a crucifix and Golgotha replaced the rose-winged visions of youth, and hope offered the extinction in place of the gratification of desire.

"Mam'zelle, Monsieur Félix asks if you have forgotten the key of the medicine chest?"

"*Ah! la la!*" The suspended avalanche of neglected commissions fell upon her.

"Mam'zelle, Monsieur Félix asks . . ."

"I hear, Stasie, I hear."

She put her hand mechanically to her arm for the key-basket; "Ah, yes, my key-basket, I have left it somewhere; but where can I have left it?"

"It is impossible, Mam'zelle, to hear one word you are saying."

"I was only talking to myself, Stasie."

"*Plait-il?*"

"Nothing, Stasie, nothing."

She screamed this beyond doubt of misunderstanding, and went into the hall, audibly wondering as to the whereabouts of her key-basket. It was, perhaps, from accommodating her voice to Stasie's increasing deafness and her patience to the increasing obstinacy of this crabbed, peevish heritage, that both had become so attenuated in Mademoiselle Aurore.

The master's house, the big house as it was metaphorically called,

stood aloof in fastidious isolation from, but in watchful proximity withal of, the money-making sugar-house and plebeian quarters. It was not, to the people on the plantation at least (and few others ever came nearer to it than the road in front)—it was not, nor ever had been, simply a massive brick cottage, with tall round pillars, a tiled basement, a pointed projecting roof, and deep shady galleries. It was not this, nor any other technically defined edifice, any more than the altar is a carpenter's contrivance to believers, or Louis XIV. was a man of small stature to his courtiers. It was never intended to be an ordinary, common dwelling-place for ordinary, common people, and time had respected the original purpose.

Changes had come into the world, and even crept into the parish of St. Charles, but a rigid quarantine had kept all but the inevitable revolutions of Nature and reform from the house and its inmates, and had preserved in unbroken transmission the atmosphere and spirit of an age which supplied adventurous noblemen with principalities in a new world, and equipped them with a princely largesse of power from an old one. As far as bricks and mortar and hand-sawed cypress boards and hand-made nails could do it, they expressed here caste, wealth, power, pride, government, religion. Whatever the record of other similar houses may be, this one had maintained its responsibilities and sustained its traditions with a spirit that Versailles might not have blushed to own, and imitate. The garden, with its carefully planned star and crescent-shaped beds, had paths which a century ago connected them into a milky way of loveliness and sweetness; encouraging and inspiring walks for lovers; but now a riotous growth of roses had tangled it into such a wilderness that the original gardener would have needed divine guidance through his own work, and lovers, had there been any now, would have been restricted to the broad avenue leading from house to river without deviations or obscurities for either feet or hearts. It was hedged all around with wild orange, except in front where the river was allowed a glance at the gallery. What had once been a grateful shade was now a damp gloom. The magnolias and oaks had so abused their privilege of growing that they leaned their branches against the very roof itself, and veiled with their moss the little Gothic windows and the observatory into complete inutility; frightening away even the vivacious tendencies of October from the front of the somnolent, superannuated homestead. Here it was always seventeenth century and retrospection and regrets, but on the other side of the house,

where the trees had been cut and the sun shone, the breeze was welcome to frolic and sing; there it was always nineteenth century with the latest change of date, for there were Monsieur Félix's bedchamber and office.

There was a beautiful vista through the orange trees to the river, and there were ever-varying heights of rose and gold and lilac overhead—a mocking-bird sang in the shadows of the neglected garden. Eugénie Lareveillère, balancing herself backward and forward in the rocking-chair by the rosetted tip of her slipper, saw nothing, heard nothing but herself. Her muslin dress rose and fell light as the clouds above her, she held her chin in her hand and pursued the thoughts interrupted by Aurore; thoughts which, since Monsieur Félix's illness, had been allowed to gain more and more complete possession of her, until it seemed that all nature had become a cheval-glass to reflect her; and, not to reflect merely the dainty piquante outward figure with vexing reminders of the mutations of time and the mutability of woman, but her *interieur* also, the disordered interior of one of the undecided sex in the throes of a decision. It is true she had come to the country for reflection, but she had managed to elude it successfully until within the last two days. In a week she would return to the city;—if the summer could only have been prolonged indefinitely! The old *allée* at the school came entrancingly before her, where she and Aurore, the pretty, poor little blonde and the pretty rich little brunette used to promenade arm in arm in the twilight, interchanging the deep mysteries and experiences of their sixteen-year-old hearts. The confidences ceased as soon as there was really something to confide. Madame longed for just one such twilight, moment, but the only *allée* was the broad one to the river and—they were not sixteen, and Aurore could think of nothing but her religion and sugar-making.

"If I only had a friend, an adviser, ah! a woman ought never to be without one;—two in fact."

The evening was getting cool; she tied her handkerchief around her throat and moved her chair closer to the wall.

"If it were only a question of duty; there was nothing a woman could not do for duty, or religion; that made marriage so much more reasonable, so much less ridiculous, *enfin;* but love!" A rosy reflection from the clouds fell all over her face and she undid the handkerchief.

She could see her friends smile delicately, and raise their

shoulders ever so slightly, and hear the "ho! ho! ho!" of some irrepressible *commère.*

"Love! what! she believes in it still? *elle en veut, encore*, what innocence, *hein?*"

"But is a woman's heart a thermometer to be regulated according to outside temperature?" she asked herself, indignantly. "Ah! if *pauvre maman* were here!"

The tears came in her eyes, as they always did at the remembrance of the pale, abraded face and shrinking, poor genteel figure of her mother. Many an "All Saints" had passed since she had placed her first chrysanthemum bouquet and black bead souvenir before *pauvre maman's* tomb in the old Saint Louis Cemetery.

"If she were here, she would decide for me!"

Eugénie had not been required to say even a word to her fiancé Lareveillère. He had seen her at the exhibition of her school. She played the harp and wore sleeves to fall back off her arms and her golden curls were all that hid her neck. She had the dress still; poor maman made it, and trimmed it with the lace from her own wedding dress. *Pauvre maman* was only afraid that the fiancé might change his mind; *pas de chance!*

And he whose companionship had been so thorough an education in men and matrimony, he had his bouquet and souvenir also on "All Saints," and a mass besides, just the same as if . . .

"Whatever marriage is, it is least of all what a school-girl thinks."

There was something of herself buried in the same tomb, too; seventeen years old, fresh and innocent, shrouded in a bridal veil. "Ah! if the young only knew more or the old less." These thoughts always came to her with such peculiar emphasis that the tears which usually rose over "poor maman" fell over herself.

The old deaf Stasie came from under the gallery and walked out in front with her conch shell to blow the summons to supper. She was stiff with rheumatism, and the wavering melancholy notes fell on the air like a *Memento mori.* With characteristic obstinacy she held to the office intrusted to her when she was elastic and graceful, when her wrinkled skin was bright smooth gold, when her lips were full and red, and her teeth white and firm as the shell they clasped. That was before the trees were allowed to overshadow the garden, and the moss to hang in such mournful folds, when the roses were kept in subjection, when the occupants of the tombs under the

clump of cypresses out there, her masters and mistresses, hurried in from fields, levee, and garden at her clear resonant calls; calls which easily vaulted the broad stream and fell in musical cadence on the opposite bank.

Marie Modeste caught the sound on the levee, and started as if she were still at school and still punishable.

"*Aïe*, Marcelite! the horn! I shall be late again for supper."

Oh la nature! la belle nature! Marie had written compositions on it, and learned poetry about it; but that was before she and Racine and Corneille had seen it. This was all different, these sunsets and moon-risings, these clouds and stars and fields, the river, the trees, the flowers, the animals, the poultry, the men and women in the quarters, with their primeval domesticity, the slow movements, the sudden developments, the mysteries, the revelations, the veils withdrawn, one after another, like the mists from the river, until the great stream of life lay bare before her awed gaze. How much of the world lay outside the walls of St. Denis, unmentioned in geography or history! How much of God outside the catechism! What was a school life of fourteen years in comparison with a plantation life of three months! Her imagination had not prepared her for it; there was no end to thinking about it; every moment a new thought shone out in a blank space like the stars in the sky, and still her mind was not full.

The brick-dust on the bare floor crackled under her feet as she hastily entered the dining-room in the basement, almost expecting to hear the customary, "Twenty-five lines by heart, mademoiselle."

Madame and Mademoiselle Aurore were at the table, Stasie was bringing in the large glasses of cold boiled milk, with the heavy cream wrinkling on top. A candelabra of two candles illuminated the table, while its fellow dispelled the gloom of the tall mantelpiece, and enabled Mademoiselle Aurore's guests and the portrait of her father to see each other dimly. There were very few living operations in the old house that did not go on in the presence of some pictured Angely. They hung in every room against the pale-green walls variegated by damp and mould; a diminishing line, nourished by constant intermarriage, until Mademoiselle Aurore and Monsieur Félix looked like their first Louisiana progenitors seen through the small end of an opera-glass. Mademoiselle Aurore was talking excitedly. "*Ma chère!* you will scarcely believe it; I can hardly re-

cover from the surprise myself. Talk of changes; that's a change, *tien?* But Féfé will actually have to send to the city this roulaison for Italians, Italians!"—she pronounced the name with every facial expression of disgust—"Italians to take off the crops; if poor papa could see that!" She looked with filial reverence at the beardless youth in the gilt frame. Her papa had been painted when at school in France, and died too soon to leave a more parental representation of himself. "But, Stasie, give Mademoiselle Marie some *fricassée, fricassée! fricassée!* That is what competition does; negroes running from place to place to get five cents more pay, and it all comes from that old Sîmon and Mr. Smith. What more can you expect; they do not care; they have no sentiment. A plantation is a sugar factory to them, that is all. The idea that such *canaille* should be allowed to profit by the ruin of our old families and buy up the finest places in Louisiana. Oh! they can afford to offer more to negroes than others, and force us to hire Italians. Old Sîmon; Stasie can tell you who old Sîmon is; you ought to hear Stasie talk about him. She remembers the day well when he used to go up and down the coast with a pack on his back, crying *Rabais*, and selling things to the negroes;—it is only right that he should pay them well now, he made them pay enough, *vas!* and now he owns *La Trinité.* And Mr. Smith, *tiens* Eugénie, you remember Nathalie Cortez at school; you know when she graduated? Well, her daughter has just been married to this Mr. Smith. Don't repeat it as coming from me, you know, but," she lowered her voice, "his father was a negro trader—a negro trader, my dear! absolutely a man Nathalie would not have permitted to sit at the table with her. Stasie knows; you ask Stasie. That's what poverty does." Her face was red and her eyes gleamed with excitement.

"I cannot hear a word you say, mam'zelle," said Stasie, in despair. "If you would only speak a little more distinctly instead of getting excited."

"The *pain-perdu!* the *pain-perdu*," screamed Mademoiselle Aurore, eagerly profiting by the opportunity. "And Féfé, he exasperates me so, whatever old Sîmon or Mr. Smith gets Féfé thinks he must buy, too; vacuum pans, condensers, steam-trains, bagasse burners, a perfect 'galimatias' of machinery. As if gentlemen needed all that; and as if they had not been making sugar long enough in Louisiana without it. For my part, I like the old open kettles, and I prefer the sugar too, though it was not so white,—and

Stasie, she prefers it too. In poor papa's time it was all so different; but Félix has his own ideas, he loves everything modern and new, he is all for the practical; the house and garden might just as well be in Texas, for all he cares about them; and then, after all, if old Sîmon or Mr. Smith makes sugar a little whiter than ours, or sells it a little bit higher, oh! then it is Good Friday the rest of the winter. But, *mon chêre*, I tell him, 'Think who they are.'"

"Monsieur Félix asks mam'zelle to come there just one moment," said Edmond, Stasie's brother, putting his head inside the door.

"Oh, I know what it is, it is that estimate I forgot to copy. *Sans excuses*, *chérie*, you see how it is."

Before Monsieur Félix's illness it was very gay after supper, sitting on the gallery watching the shooting-stars above the river, talking about old times *avant la guerre*, or playing dominos in the hall for bon-bons; but now it was sadness itself. Madame and Marie went up the winding steps to the gallery to await Mademoiselle Aurore and her never-ceasing theme of plantation crises. The moon had risen, and changed the landscape from the showy splendor of sunset to a weird etherealization. The rose vines, which had crept over from the garden to garland and wreathe the brick pillars, threw fantastic, flitting shadows on the gallery floor, and checkered their faces. The broad path to the river was silver, the tall gate posts were whitened into marble monuments, the river was a boundless sea of golden ripples. The faint sounds of animated life in the quarters made the loneliness and silence inside the wild-orange hedge more intense. Madame sank in her rocking-chair for another *séance* with herself:

"Marie was young, Marie could have ideals, Marie could yet dream in the moonlight unchidden by life and experience."

She looked at the slight, childish figure, seated on the balustrade, leaning her head far back in her arms, looking up, beyond the moss, the trees, and the clouds, to follow the moon making and unmaking phantasmagorial cities, lakes, and mountains in the world above her. Lost in an ecstasy of self-forgetfulness, drifting away from earth and mortality, soaring higher and higher on the wings of a pure, fresh imagination, until the glorious orb itself is reached, and the silver rays make her one of themselves.

"I was once like Marie, and she will one day be like me. Why must women be always looking for the unattainable?—why cannot we be contented? *Enfin*—one cannot always be seventeen and wear

white dresses; but if it is the will of God, why must we have these feelings, these moments, for example?"

As through the intervening shadows of the trees she could see the dazzling river, so beyond her present doubts and hesitations a transcendental prospect offered itself; but sarcastic society and frigid friends came between to be propitiated by sophistical reasonings and prosaic excuses. If Aurore were only sympathetic as she used to be! But to a woman who scorned one honeymoon what reasons would justify two?

"I shall not tell her! that I am determined; she shall not find it out, until . . . I would rather confide in Marcelite."

The *coiffeuse*, in her silk apron and white kerchief, passed on tiptoe not to disturb her, holding her stiff calico dress to keep it from rattling; she went to Marie.

"Bébé!" she whispered.

The girl took no notice of her.

"Bébé!"

"*Paix, Marcelite, paix.*" She barely moved her lips; it was so delicate, so exquisite, a breath would destroy it—her moon-dream.

"You will catch cold."

"Ah, Marcelite!" she said, entreatingly; "why could you not have left me one moment more? Now . . ." She sighed and turned her eyes upward once again.

Marcelite advanced to the edge of the balustrade and looked up too, to see what attraction the commonplace moon was offering. She knew that when the moon was on the increase it was a good time to cut the ends of the hair, and some persons could read the *bon aventure* in the moonlight, and the Voudous—she made the sign of the cross whenever she thought of them, although her experience had proved it a very insufficient protection against their charms. She asked herself, eying Marie from under her heavy lids, why her bébé looked so thin and pale; she was smaller and lighter even than when at school; after three months in the country too! And her eyes with the same hollow black shadows, why did not those shadows go, now that studying was all done and life was so pleasant. A fierce impatience and rebellion surged in her as usual, when confronted by what she could not understand or prevent. Other girls were women in appearance at Marie's age; why did she not shed her childhood? Why did not her arms round and her shoulders soften? Why could not some of her own exuberant flesh and blood be given

to her bébé. She did not want it; she would like to tear it off and fling it away, if her bébé were to be always so *chétive*, so *triste*. One sickness. . . .

"Bébé," she whispered, her voice trembling at the thought; "you will catch cold, or fever, the air is so bad at this season."

"There, I hope you are satisfied now!" Marie said, irritably, jumping down. "If Marcelite would only let her alone. The moonlight was so beautiful, and at school they never enjoyed the moonlight except in contraband. In a week she would be back at school. Why could not Marcelite let her forget that, it was so seldom she could forget it. Marcelite never thought about it, nor madame either, but she;" she had rehearsed it so often the whole scene came before her in a flash.

"*Tiens, voilà Marie Modeste*, back again at school! *mais, chère*, is *le vieux* going to make you stay another year? *quelle injustice!*" She would shrug her shoulders, and say in an indifferent way, just as if it were a matter of course, "Ah! you know, it is a romance—all a romance of Marcelite's. My papa, he was killed during the war, my mamma, she died when I was a baby, and Marcelite—just fancy, *chère*, that good Marcelite—worked for me night and day, to send me to school; she it was who gave me everything."

She shrugged her shoulders, straightened her head, and her lips moved rapidly, just as if she were at school, only the tightness came right across her chest, always just at this point, and she had to swallow very rapidly to keep the tears from coming to her eyes; for the important thing was not to cry, not to let them suspect. Oh, she had learned at school not to cry; even Madame Joubert, when she used to stand her in the corner with the foolscap on, for making faults in her dictation, could not make her cry, when she was a little girl, and she was a woman now. Did Marcelite think she was afraid of the fever? If it would only come and kill her before next week, it would be better, far better, what had she to . . ."

"I shall go to bed; come, Marcelite." It was better anyway to be in the bed, in the dark, all by herself. She stopped to kiss madame good-night; madame in her pretty *toilette*, with her rings and laces and ribbons. Ah! God was good to madame, she did not have such things to think about.

"*Bonne-nuit, ma mignonne;* going to mass again to-morrow morning?"

For Mademoiselle Aurore had drawn Marie into the active rou-

tine of her religious exercises. Masses, confessions, communions, retreats, penances, novenas, fastings; they had discouraged the kindly efforts of nature in behalf of her physical improvement, but her mind reflected the benefit of the discipline by a satisfactory state of quiescence. There were moments of transcendental serenity accorded to her when suffering appeared the only proper joy, and martyrdom the only proper vocation of women; but after a long walk, or a visit to the quarters, and talking to the women there, or the moonlight, as at present, they vanished, these moments; and the lives of the saints she yearned to imitate; her heart rejected them, and their being exposed to the jeering multitude, or thrown to beasts; what was that to going back to St. Denis? She was at the pitiable age when sensitiveness is a disease, before moral courage has had time to develop. "*You* are happy, *ma fille?*" Madame drew the face again to her lips; she loved to hear it confirmed.

"I, madame? I?"

"But, of course, Marie is going to mass with me to-morrow."

Mademoiselle Aurore answered the question she had heard in the hall. The moon poured its effulgence on her pious, enthusiastic face as, an hour afterward, from her seat on the staircase, she was still eloquently extolling to her friend the celestial peace vouchsafed to those women, and only to those women, who, renouncing with fortitude the pleasures of sex and youth, forsake the world and consecrate themselves to the perfect vocation of perpetual virginity and prayer, thus preparing their souls for those beatitudes in a future life reserved solely for the pure and undefiled.

"Madame is as bad as Marcelite," thought Marie in her chamber; "but what can they suppose I am thinking of all the time?"

The slight excitement of breakfast had worn away the next day, which so far was bringing forth ameliorating modifications of the conditions of its predecessor. Monsieur Félix's sciatica was on the wane; his confidence in himself and Mademoiselle Aurore's trust in the saints being both justified. The normal, monotonous uniformity was settling over the house, hiding the traces of the late disruption of its harmony. There was still the sound of footfalls passing up and down the back steps to and from Monsieur Félix's room; but if the door chanced to be left open now, only the calmest voice in the most business-like tones could be distinguished giving needful commands and directions. Mademoiselle Aurore's time was no longer

fractured by importunate calls. A slight frost in the morning, the first of the season, encouraged her and cheered her brother; it sweetened the cane and acknowledged her prayers. Slight frosts now, on the magnificent stand in the field, and Bel Angely would surpass any former record.

The friends sat in their rocking-chairs in the hall, dimmed to a comfortable compromise between the contesting claims of their eyes and complexions. A round mosaic table, with brass claw feet, held their work-baskets. Mademoiselle Aurore was adding highly ornamental golden leaves to red paper roses, to be twisted, according to ecclesiastical convention, into flat pyramidal displays for the parish church; a commencement in the liquidation of her indebtedness. Notwithstanding her confidence in her own rectitude of purpose and her intimate negotiations with the Church, she would have felt more serenity this morning had she not sent Gabi for the mail yesterday, or had she frankly told Monsieur Félix all about it. He was improving so fast, she would have to tell him to-day; by to-morrow he would find it all out by himself. Thank Heaven! the mule at least had come home during the night.

"Oh, *chère amie!*" she was saying, "I get very much discouraged with life, I assure you; it takes a great deal of religion to enable us women to support it. It is so full of contradictions—useless contradictions. I sometimes wish that there were no more hopes given us. They are no better than toy balloons; they dance before us very beautifully for a time, then *crac!* they burst, and we are left *plantées* there until we get another one. I do not complain, it is against my religion; but if you knew how many hopes I have seen go to pieces that way! *Mon Dieu!* I am tired of getting new ones. Ah, you are fortunate, your life is so simple, so clear, so smooth. Now, there's Gabi, I should not have sent him, ah! I see that clearly this morning. But I have raised that child ever since he was a baby. He was picked up in the sugar-house and brought to me. I have no idea even who his mother is. Well, I thought I would take him and make a reasonable human being of him. Féfé and Stasie were against it, of course; and they have never liked him; and I wanted to push him; I thought I would give him the opportunity. Well, perhaps Féfé is right, after all. And he learned his catechism so well, and made such a good first communion! Last spring, you know what I did? I got all the children of the proper age in the quarters, I taught them the catechism myself, and I made them all

take their first communion; there was a cane-cart full. Féfé and Stasie were against that too, but I was firm about it. Ah, it is so elevating to work like that! Féfé, he said they were rascals already, and that I would only make hypocrites of them. Hypocrites! I ask you, Eugénie, if religion makes hypocrites? but that is Monsieur Voltaire again. I will never hear the last of this from Stasie, and next spring Féfé will only be more determined; I know Féfé."

Madame shook her head responsively. Marie's surprised, pained interrogation, Mademoiselle Aurore's discourse, had procured for her a sleepless, penitential night. She was disposed this morning for any pessimistic generalities on women, but answered not so much Mademoiselle Aurore as her own self:

"Yes, our lives are surprise-boxes to us women; we never know what is going to come out of them; our own plans, our own ideas count for nothing. Look at our schoolmates, not one turned out as she expected. Those who had a vocation to religious lives, who would be nothing but nuns, they were the first ones married and having children christened. Those who were ready to fall in love with every new tenor at the opera, they became *dévotes*. Those who cared only for money fell in love with poor men; and those who made their lives a poem with love for the hero, they—they married for money. When we are old and *passée*, we get what would have made our youth divine. Men are the serious occupation of fate, women are their playthings."

"Ah, yes, men are more fortunate." Mademoiselle Aurore eagerly availed herself of the fissure in which to insert her peculiar grievances. "There is something sure, something stable in a man's life. Look at Féfé; I do not say he has not had griefs, disappointments, misfortunes, even, in his life, but they did not change it, only interrupted it a minute; with me, those things take away my life itself." Her voice quivered, and the emotion in her face made her look something as she did at sixteen. She took a long breath and resumed: "It is like this, either Féfé would not have sent Gabi for the mail, or Gabi would have brought it properly, or he would have informed the whole world about it, me first of all, *coûte que coûte*. He would not have managed the truth on account of my prejudices, he would have had no hopes attached to it; now with me . . ." She was going to open her heart a little lower down to madame, and reveal those hopes so paltry as to be involved in Gabi's good conduct, so grand as to influence a terrestrial and celestial future. *Mondaine*

as, to her disappointment, she had found Eugénie to be, she could well remember the angelic devotion of the little wife to that old *roué* Lareveillère. How patiently she had labored with him after the stroke of paralysis confined him night and day to his house; teaching him the graces of repentance, leading him to the altar he had deserted, persuading him to the sacraments he had mocked; forcing him, actually forcing him, to give to charity a goodly portion of that inheritance she had so hardly earned. Whatever small prospect of heaven the old French merchant now enjoyed, he owed it to Eugénie, and no one else. Aurore was determined to drive Messieurs Voltaire and Rousseau from the heart of Monsieur Félix. Eugénie could not but sympathize and encourage her. And madame; at the quiver of her friend's voice, the softening of her face, the old *allée* and the twilight came before her and she felt that she might perhaps venture. . . .

"Ta-ta-ta-ta-ta-ta-ta!" A tiny staccato rap, light as the pecking of a bird. The ladies raised their heads simultaneously with a nervous start. It had a preternatural sound, so sudden, just at that moment. There it was again!

"But, Eugénie, what can that be?" She looked accusingly at the row of kinsmen and women gleaming on the wall in their heavy gilt frames.

Eugénie held her hand against her heart. "How it frightened me! it must be some one knocking."

"Some one knocking at the front door? Impossible!"

"Some one, perhaps, to see Monsieur Félix."

"Félix? but his visitors all know they have to go around to the other gallery. There it is again!"

"Maybe it is some one who does not know."

"I will call Stasie."

"But let us see who it is."

"Not for the world! It might be something horrible out there."

She dropped her flowers and commenced a shrill, "Stasie! Stasie!" from the very table, continuing it to the back gallery and out into the yard to some inaudible distance. Madame had disappeared when they returned.

"Go, *ma bonne* Stasie, it must be some one to see Monsieur Félix; conduct him around to the other side of the house."

The door was carefully unbolted and Stasie, with all imaginable precautions against sudden assault, put her head out.

"But what are you doing, Stasie?" screamed Mademoiselle Aurore, as she saw the door steadily open. She had not time for the accustomed iteration, but was forced to escape unceremoniously into Madame Lareveillère's room to escape the view of the intruder. Madame was unbuttoning her *peignoir*.

"What do you think?" Aurore was excited, or she would not have been guilty of the filial impiety, "that *sotte* Stasie has actually opened the front door, and there is a stranger, at this moment, in the hall. But no; impossible!" as she heard a stiff door being pushed open—"in the parlor. She has invited him into the parlor."

"Mam'zelle," said Stasie, coming into the room.

"Well, Stasie, I compliment you! Letting a stranger into the house this way!" Mademoiselle Aurore's voice was strident, the tone rather than the words penetrated to the ears so tightly bandaged by the faded bandanna.

"What do you mean by opening the house this way? Are you crazy?"

"He is a gentleman—a visitor." Then as the full meaning of Mademoiselle Aurore's attack came to her, she raised her voice, querulously: "*Comment donc!* Would you have me shut the door in his face? Would you have me drive him away—a gentleman—when he comes on a visit?"

"What nonsense! A visitor!" She turned to her friend for a dispassionate opinion.

"What! You are undressing, Eugénie?"

"Only changing my *peignoir*, Aurore. The air seems a little cool to me."

"You must understand, Stasie, there is some mistake. If he does not come to see Monsieur Félix on business, he must be going to old Sîmon's or Mr. Smith's. Go and explain to him—although you should have told him on the gallery, not brought him into the house." She uttered the words emphatically, close to Stasie's ear, and pushed her gently out of the door. "If Stasie would only allow me to get a younger servant!" she exclaimed, when the door closed.

"There, mam'zelle, there; see for yourself! Ah, I told you so! Shut the door in his face! Put him out by the shoulders! Ah, that was not the etiquette of your grandmother, *par exemple!*"

Marcelite had come in by another door. She slipped behind madame and whispered something in her ear.

"*Mais qu'est-ce que c'est que ça?*" Mademoiselle Aurore looked perfectly nonplussed. "I cannot understand it. Monsieur . . ."

"My *négligé* from Paris," whispered madame to Marcelite, so that Mademoiselle Aurore could not notice it.

"Monsieur Armand Goupilleau. Goupilleau? Goupilleau? But I never heard of a Goupilleau. And you, Eugénie?"

"Monsieur Armand Goupilleau? Surely I know Monsieur Armand Goupilleau. He is a notary public in New Orleans—oh, but one of the most celebrated notaries there! He is a good, good friend of mine, an old friend. He advises me about all my affairs; and an institute like the St. Denis requires a great deal of advice, I can tell you. Do I know him? I should think so. He is like a father to me, in fact."

Marcelite dropped the *négligé* over her head. "Just tie this ribbon for me, *ma bonne.*" Her thin, white fingers, with the long, pointed nails, could only wander aimlessly amid the bows and laces. But the *coiffeuse* needed neither directions nor explanations. Her dark face glowed with intelligence; she seemed transformed by a sudden illumination; her deft, light fingers never worked so felicitously, pulling out lace, tying ribbon, putting in ear-rings, lifting up a puff here and pinning a curl there, until the whole expression of the *coiffure* was reanimated, passing a powder-puff over the pale face, brushing out the eyebrows, rummaging through a *sachet* for the appropriate handkerchief.

"Is he married, Eugénie?"

"But no, Aurore."—"What brutality!" she thought.

"Ah!" Aurore opened the door for them to go out.

"One moment, madame," whispered Marcelite. She was kneeling on the floor with a pair of high-heeled bronze slippers in her hand.

"Ah, I knew it! Marcelite is more of a woman than Aurore."

The *négligé* hung in long, beautiful, diaphanous folds, and exhaled a delicate fragrance of *vetivert*, as Marcelite shut the door on both ladies.

"*Ah, mon ami!* what a delightful surprise! Never could you come at a better time." She held both hands to him. "Let me present you to my friend, my best friend, my old schoolmate, my sister, in fact, Mademoiselle Angely. *Chère* Aurore, this is my good friend Monsieur Goupilleau, of whom you have heard me speak so often. Now you will tell us what good fairy sent you to the parish of St. Charles."

"As I said in the note which yesterday monsieur your brother received . . ."

"Ah, *mon Dieu!*" exclaimed Mademoiselle Aurore, involuntarily. "Gabi! I must tell Félix immediately." She abruptly left the room, Monsieur Goupilleau bowing before her. Madame's vivacity fled with her; the social graces, which hung like a silken domino around her, seemed to vanish, leaving her as undisguised and embarrassed in her natural emotion as a peasant before the questioning, expectant eyes of the notary.

"And you also did not receive my letter yesterday?"

"No, as you hear, an accident . . ."

He took her indiscreet hand and guided her through the twilight of the large parlors to a sofa. It was a letter that had cost an effort to write; the wording of inexhaustible sentiment. He could never speak what he had written alone in his quiet office, her image before him, the musty records around him, and a companionless life behind him. His heart, his eager, long-suppressed heart, drove the clean, sharp steel notarial pen, and what had it not said? So, it was all lost by an accident! but it had contained one affair of business.

"Madame Joubert has made a proposition to purchase your interest in the St. Denis."

"Madame Joubert!" she repeated, in supreme astonishment. Madame Joubert at the head of her brilliant aristocratic *pension!* Why, she had not a single qualification, nothing, except an education. The item of business brought reprieve, but also disappointment. Had she, then, been wrong in her intuitions, premature in her expectations?

"And Mademoiselle Motte?"

"Ah! Marie Modeste!" The sweet, novel, motherly look came into her eyes, the one beautiful expression of which life had hitherto deprived them.

"*Mon ami*, how can I tell you! When I think of Marcelite I am ashamed of myself, I who am white and have an education. Ah, I detest myself, but you see I was thinking so much of my own affairs."

A blush that must have been caused by her thoughts sprang from her heart and spread up to her face, and warmed even the tips of her chilled fingers.

"Aurore knew it, Aurore felt it to be a truth. And I promised to be a mother to her. . . ."

"And I," said the notary, "a father."

"Would a mother forget her child, a young girl, for her own affairs?" It was a chaplet of self-accusations, the penitential accumulation of a wakeful, feverish night, exaggerated, incoherent. "But I thought she was happy; she is so young, you know."

She raised her eyes to his. The swine, not she had received his letter, but his eyes contained it all, and were repeating it over and over again to the hair, the head, the face, the figure beside him; those wonderful, eloquent eyes of a recluse poet; and she read it all and could not feign misunderstanding. His timid, hesitating words were entirely superfluous, so long as she looked at him; but her own eyes—it was safer to turn them on the piano. The diamonds gleamed on her excited fingers. Last night, when she could not sleep, she had composed it all—she always prepared her pretty speeches and notes beforehand for possible emergencies. It was to be a consent; oh yes, there had never been any doubt about that, but a consent based on the exalted motives of duty and self-sacrifice, and a common obligation toward Marie Modeste; a consent expressive of all that she did not feel, one worthy of Mademoiselle Aurore, and unobjectionable to the most fastidious wit of a sarcastic society. Her fluent tongue recited the *chef-d'œuvre* as if they had all been there to listen, were stationed behind the heavy curtains to hear. Only the notary himself had been forgotten, he alone should not have been present. The light died away from his face, and a grave misapprehension clouded his eyes.

"I shall go now and announce it to Aurore myself and Monsieur Félix. Oh yes, there is no need to conceal it a moment from the world, and you can explain it to Marie Modeste. I shall send her to you immediately."

It was as if she were speaking to her professor of mathematics. His letter might have made it all different! He had offered the love of his life-time, he had asked only for love. Was she to give him only duty, self-sacrifice? . . . And the *tête-à-tête* was coming to an end!

She stood a moment to steady herself on her high heels; the room was as private as a grave, as secret as her own heart at midnight, it was mysterious and still; she looked all around at the portraits on the wall—portraits, not mirrors, and, as it were a dream, she forgot all that she had been remembering for three months; forgot it all completely, deliciously. She turned to the sofa, but the notary

had risen, too; he had been standing at her side pleading, reproachful.

"*Mon ami.*" The lace sleeves fell back from the arms she held to him, all her heart trembled in her voice, and looked through the tears in her eyes. "*Mon ami*, it is not so; do not believe it; it is not duty, Armand."

There was no one to see them or hear them. The birds outside were singing and the sun shining, the fresh new breezes rustling the trees, the cane sweetening, the roses resting in the shade, the negroes were working in the field, the women nursing and tending in the quarters, Marie Modeste was listening to curious prophecies from Marcelite, Mademoiselle Aurore was explaining to Monsieur Félix, Stasie was grumbling, Gabi was submitting to his delayed punishment from Edmond. The world had forgotten them; it was rolling on without them, or, rather, it had rolled back for them. She was seventeen, dreaming in the *allée* under the oleanders of love and a first lover. He was twenty-five, rhyming sonnets in the moonlight, *à l'inconnue*. And the rapture that came to them then in a vision, infolded them now as they exchanged their first embrace.

GRACE KING.

CRITICISMS, NOTES, AND REVIEWS.

RECENT EARTHQUAKES AND THEIR STUDY.

THE recent disastrous earthquake, by which the city of Charleston has suffered so severely, has brought more prominently into notice in our country the gradually growing interest in the study of seismic phenomena, which has reached an extent little known to the general public. In the last few years this has been fostered and increased by the occurrence of several earthquakes and volcanic eruptions of such extent and violence as to attract general attention. We mention volcanoes with earthquakes, not because the latter are necessarily connected with the former, nor because they are always even due to the same or similar causes ; but the two are so inseparably associated in the public mind that the news of one always suggests the other.

As indication of the growing interest alluded to, let us look back only three years, and recall the place that volcanic and seismic phenomena have held in the public attention in that time. Go back to the outburst of Krakatoa, in the Straits of Sunda, on August 27, 1883, by which one-half the mountain peak was blown into the air, to form islands in the adjacent sea by its falling débris, and to fill the upper atmosphere with its finer dust ; a stupendous explosion, the sound of which was audible over one-fifteenth of the surface of the earth, and the air-wave from which travelled more than three times around the globe. Here was an eruption which at once arrested the attention of the world ; which was made the subject of special scientific investigation by the Dutch East Indian Government, by the French Ministry of Public Instruction, and by the Royal Society of London ; and which afforded materials to so many private authors that the bibliographies for 1884 and 1885 contain over seventy titles relating to this eruption or its consequences alone. In the fall of the same year came the wonderfully brilliant sunsets, the cause of which was traced to the dust from Krakatoa, and which appealed to the unscientific observer, who could only look and admire, as well as to those who were able to discuss the causes. In April, 1884, Southern England was shaken, and the interest excited led to the publication during the following year of an extended investigation by members of the Essex Field Club. In August, 1884, our own Atlantic seaboard, from Maine to Virginia, was shaken by an earthquake, doing little damage, but severe for that region ; and our readers will not have forgotten how, for days thereafter, the newspapers were full of reports and speculations concerning it. Then at Christmas, 1884, the Spanish peninsula was the scene of an earthquake

which damaged or destroyed whole villages, and the circumstances of which were investigated by a Spanish Government Commission and by a committee of the French Academy, both publishing reports. Then, after a somewhat longer interval of quiet, the summer of 1886 is signalized by outbreaks in New Zealand in June, devastating the country, destroying villages, and causing many deaths; in August by general earthquakes in the Mediterranean, felt from Italy to the Levant; and on August 31 by the Charleston earthquake in our own land. This most recent exhibition of seismic activity has much exceeded in destructiveness anything that has happened in our country within the days of history, affecting an area of 900,000 square miles, from the Great Lakes to the Gulf and from the ocean to the Mississippi, and for days occupying the prominent place in the newspapers of the country.

But the work of studying these phenomena has not been confined to the last few years nor to any one country. In many lands we find evidences of this activity. For quite a number of years instrumental observations have been carried on by Palmieri, at the observatory at Vesuvius, and more than a year ago the system of seismic observation established in Italy, under the direction of Rossi, already included twenty-eight stations provided with delicate instruments and reporting to the Central Geodynamic Observatory at Rome. In the neighboring country of Switzerland an earthquake commission was appointed in 1879 by the Swiss Society of Natural Sciences, and has since been actively at work, under the leadership of such men as Forel, Förster, and Heim. Numerous publications, both in French and German, have emanated from this commission. The Hungarian Geological Society has also its earthquake commission, whose labors date from about 1882. In February, 1885, the French Academy of Sciences appointed a standing committee on volcanic and seismic phenomena, including MM. Daubrée, Jamin, Fouqué, and others, and the subject proposed for the Vaillant prize in 1886 related to the causes of earthquakes. The special commission of the Academy on the Spanish earthquakes has already been referred to, as has also the Spanish commission on the same subject. In England the British Association has for several years had a committee with a grant of money for the study of Japanese earthquakes, which has reported from time to time; and in February, 1884, the Council of the Royal Society (London) appointed a committee to collect accounts of the Krakatoa outburst. The work of individuals, under the auspices of the Essex Field Club, in studying the earthquake of April 22, 1884, resulted in the publication of a volume of 225 pages; and a recent issue of the International Scientific Library has been a volume on Earthquakes, by John Milne, of Japan. To this author has also been awarded a prize offered by the Dutch Royal Institution of Engineers for an essay on theoretical methods of using earthquake observations.

In Japan the work has been most actively carried on by the Seismological Society of Japan, founded in 1880, and which has since then published nine volumes of Transactions. The members of this society have devoted their attention mainly to the improvement of the instru-

mental means of observation, and the labors of Ewing, Milne, Gray, and others, aided by the unusual opportunity of testing their inventions afforded by the almost daily shocks of moderate intensity, have resulted in giving to science an entirely new class of seismoscopes and seismographs, which now approach the rank of instruments of precision. The influence of this Japanese society is felt in far-distant parts of the world, for both in England and in America, among the prominent workers in this field, are those who have been at some time residents of Japan; and the seismographic instruments about to be installed at Ben Nevis and at the Lick Observatory are made from the designs of Professor Ewing, formerly of Japan, but now in Scotland. Japan is also the first country to establish in its University of Tokio a Department of Seismology, with a native professor devoting his time to that science.

Thus much of other countries; let us turn now to the United States and see what is being done here. For a dozen years some few isolated persons had been quietly working in this little-known field, and about two years ago, in November, 1884, a number of them met in Washington, at the call of the Director of the U. S. Geological Survey, to consult together, and endeavor to arrange for a more systematic observation of seismic phenomena. They have met several times since then, and were gradually getting ready to establish a system of instrumental observation, when the recent earthquake in South Carolina occurred, and turned the thoughts of all from the quiet investigation into the best form of seismoscopes and the best area in which to place them, to the consideration of how to make the most of the unexpected opportunity that had presented itself. The Geological Survey at once took up the matter, skilled observers were immediately sent to Charleston to examine the phenomena there displayed, before repairs should change their appearance, and steps were taken to systematize and reduce the vast amounts of reports collected from the public press and from private documents, of which latter large numbers have been received, in response to lists of questions distributed through the newspapers and by special circulars. This work is still going on, with what results we shall no doubt be informed in due time by the officers of the Survey. From first reports, however, it would appear that the focus of disturbance was somewhat north of Charleston, probably not far from Summerville, S. C. In connection with the study of this earthquake, we must not omit to mention the advantage which has accrued through the very general adoption of the standard time in the United States, facilitating very much the comparison of observations in different places; and from the wide distribution of the telegraphic service, enabling the reports to be promptly sent to the central points—indeed, Washington was notified by Atlanta before the shock was felt at the former place. In comparing the destruction caused by this earthquake with that resulting from other shocks, it must also be borne in mind that the damage done will depend not only on the intensity of the shock but also on the presence or absence of buildings likely to be injured by the vibration, and it does not

follow that the recent shock was most severe in Charleston because more buildings were injured there than elsewhere, nor that this earthquake was more severe than the New Madrid earthquake of 1811, for example, especially when we remember the difference between the cities and towns of 1886 and those of 1811.

Some word will, perhaps, be expected in regard to the cause of this earthquake, but in that direction nothing can be said, except that it was apparently due to some rupture of the underlying rocks, whose exact location and exciting cause can only be inferred, if at all, after the observations have been collated and compared. There are, however, no indications of anything like a volcanic origin, nor does heat seem to have been at all directly active in its production.

THE PRESENT OUTLOOK IN PHYSICS.

For some years past the progress of physical science, especially on the experimental side, has not been marked. The establishment of the doctrine of the conservation of energy opened up a wide field for experimental investigation in the determination of the relations of one form of energy to another, and in the measurement of the equivalents of mechanical energy in these different forms. This field, within which experimental work is rather confirmatory than progressive, has been fully occupied. Berthelot and Thomsen are determining, through a very wide range of substances, the heat equivalents of chemical combination. The measurements of the absolute standard of electrical resistance, the Ohm, which have been made with great care by Lord Rayleigh, Rowland, and many others, are also, in effect, measurements of the mechanical equivalent of electrical energy. Fletcher, at Baltimore, has determined this same unit in a way which connects electrical energy and heat. Langley is investigating the heat relations of the different parts of the spectrum. Cantoni and Gerosa have obtained in a novel and simple way the already much-investigated constant, the mechanical equivalent of heat.

The same doctrine of energy and the relation of heat to change of state and volume has determined the direction of what is probably, for comprehensiveness and fruitfulness, the most valuable experimental research now in progress, that of Ramsay and Young, in the properties of vapors.

In electrical science, which, in its practical applications, fills such a place in the public eye, the work that has been done is rather the investigation of details and the improvement of methods of observation and measurement, than a real progress toward the discovery of new general laws. In the mass of facts which has been accumulated are some—such as the action of light on the electrical relations of selenium and some other bodies, and the electrical shadows which can be formed during the glow discharge—which are not yet fully explained, and may open the way to some future generalization. But

the great body of the new work can be at once brought into alignment with known laws, and offers no prospect of advancement.

In fact, most of the experimental work now appearing must be looked on rather as a broadening and deepening the old lines than as a tracing those lines further into untouched territory. It is, perhaps, well that the ground won by the general advance which followed the establishment of the doctrine of energy should be fully occupied and securely held, before great efforts are made to open up new fields for research.

The prominent forward movement is on the theoretical side. The attempt is being made to construct a mechanical model of the physical universe. Sir Wm. Thomson, in his Baltimore lectures on Molecular Dynamics, supplies such a model, to explain the properties of the medium that transmits light through space. Ketteler, in his *Theoretische Optik*, has just published, for the first time, in book form, the new kinetic method, now being developed in Germany, of treating the facts of optics. Fitzgerald, Glazebrook, J. J. Thomson, in England, Gibbs and Rowland, in our country, are trying to explain the same facts by the development of Maxwell's electromagnetic theory of light.

The differences between the supporters of the "action at a distance" theory of electricity, and those of what may be called the Faraday-Maxwell theory of action through a medium, the former of which is stronger in Germany, the latter in England, still continue irreconcilable, and the controversy, if it may be called such, proceeds with undiminished vigor. Nothing, however, of great general interest or of a conclusive nature has recently appeared.

In molecular physics, strictly so called—that is, that portion of physics which deals with those direct molecular forces that are usually treated under the heads elasticity and capillarity, to which also the kinetic theory of gases may without violence be added—there is very little being done, and most of that little is isolated and fragmentary. The investigations in elasticity of Mr. Tomlinson must be excepted from this statement. They are among the most valuable contributions to molecular physics. Scattering papers on unimportant details in the subject of capillarity have appeared, but no advance in the theory has been made, unless Lord Rayleigh's paper on molecular pressure may be excepted. The most valuable work in the general field is probably the experimental and theoretical research of Hansemann and Kirchhoff, on the passage of gases through porous walls.

Whatever may be true of the actual progress of physics at the present time, it is certain that there has never before been so wide-spread and intelligent an interest taken in the subject as now. This is, doubtless, due partly to the numerous applications of the results of physical research made in the conveniences of modern life, and partly to the more thorough instruction given in the subject in all institutions of learning, both in the class-room and in the laboratory. It has called forth a supply of text-books, which are only to be compared with the text-books of mathematics for completeness and

excellence. Many of them might more properly be considered treatises. To the demand created by this universal interest in the science is due also the republication of the collected papers and memoirs of many eminent physicists. In many cases the author himself conducts the republication. In this way have appeared the papers of Stokes, Wm. Thomson, Joule, Rankine, Foucault, Helmholtz, and Kirchhoff. Maxwell's papers have been long promised, but are unaccountably delayed. The Smithsonian Institution announces the speedy publication of the works of Joseph Henry.

To meet a similar demand many reprints of important scientific treatises and memoirs have been issued. In particular, the French Government has undertaken a series of such reprints of the works of the eminent French physicists and mathematicians. It has already issued editions of Laplace, Lagrange, and Cauchy, in most magnificent form, and will, no doubt, include in the series all those great works which rendered the French science of the first half of this century preëminent in Europe.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF PHILOSOPHY IN GERMANY.

THE last century of German philosophy is divided into two distinct periods by the death of Hegel and the subsequent disruption of the Hegelian school. The fifty years from the publication of Kant's *Critique of the Pure Reason*, in 1781, to Hegel's death, in 1831, were a period of philosophical prosperity. The few more than fifty years which have elapsed since the latter date have been marked by many characteristics of philosophical decline. Instead of a succession of masters of the first rank, exerting a widespread influence as well by their academic activity as by their published works, the later years can show few names rising above the second order; instead of the foremost place in the university curriculum, philosophy must now be content with the position of a historical discipline; where formerly her influence extended over the whole sphere of intellectual activity, science, politics, and art, as well as theology and metaphysics proper, the philosophy of Germany in recent days has seen times when her very right to existence has been loudly challenged.

And if explanation be sought for this change—for a knowledge of its causes will also help to an understanding of the phenomena of to-day—three general factors may be mentioned: the break with the à priori systems of the schools, the progress of scientific inquiry, and the external development of the nation. For fifty years the world had been greeted by system after system of metaphysics, each bringing its own new theory of existence, or, at least, a substantial modification of all preceding schemes—now the spirit of philosophy itself was almost prepared to say that the time for à priori constructions of the universe was over. The development from the Critical Philosophy to the Philosophy of the Absolute had proceeded so far that the very elements which had made German speculation so marked a moment in

the history of opinion were about to meet the reaction in the revolt from old methods of procedure, in the dissolution of the old philosophical schools, in the separation of abstract thinkers into the smallest groups, not only without great masters, but also, often, without a great leading idea. And hand in hand with this philosophical unrest, even as in part it had formed one of the underlying causes for the same, came the astounding advance in the sphere of natural science. Time had been when the metaphysician had sought the determining principle of the material world in the development of his own leading idea—now, the scientist was to use his discoveries as weapons against the speculations of his former master, while he was further preparing to attack metaphysical problems from the standpoint of inductive thought. Nor are the results of the latter's labors far to seek. They may be observed as well in the changed conditions of philosophical inquiry, and in the limited field which the spirit of the day leaves to the once powerful deductive thinker, as in the introduction of scientific methods into psychological research ; even if we leave out of view the crass materialistic and sensational systems which, happily, enjoyed far more favor thirty years ago than they do to-day. Thus, Doctor Falkenberg is well justified when he says, in his recent *History of Modern Philosophy*, p. 463 : "The philosophy of to-day, like the pre-Socratic and that of the earlier modern period, wears the badge of physics." * And Professor Wundt only outlines the general situation, in which the scientific factor plays so large a part, when he speaks of the metaphysical lectures in Germany as in part devoted to logic, in part delivered "by older men, the last surviving pillars of the once-prevalent metaphysical systems," in part consisting of efforts "which, perhaps, might better be described as against metaphysic." † To these internal causes must now be added a third, proceeding from the external development of the nation. Prussia, at the time of the Napoleonic invasion, founding a university in her capital, to help in the resurrection of the nation by the intellectual and moral training of its youth, and the empire of the last fifteen years, sated with military glory and seeking to add industrial prosperity to success in arms, furnish a contrast which must be considered as well in writing the history of opinion as in writing the history of the State. The very university which owed its foundation to the nation's reverses could boast for many years of such names as Fichte, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Hegel ; but now, in the days of national prosperity, the foremost professor in her philosophical halls can but add his testimony to the baneful influence which material progress has exerted on abstract thought.‡

These three factors, then, have united in causing the present condition of affairs ; and in a general sense it may be said that the order of their in-

* *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie von Nikolaus von Kues bis zur Gegenwart*, Dr. Richard Falkenberg, Leipzig, 1886.

† *Mind*, Vol. II., p. 496. 1877.

‡ Cf. Zeller's *Vorträge und Abhandlungen*, Vol. III. Zeller's *Geschichte der deutschen Philosophie*, concluding chapter.

fluence in time corresponds to the order of their statement here. First we have the disintegrating elements which proceeded directly from the dissolution of the à priori schools; then the increasing activity of the scientific factors, especially in the period of the *Materialismusstreit;* and, lastly, the influence of the rise of Prussia and the unification of the German nation.

But it would be serious error to exaggerate the decline in philosophical activity thus far described. Doctor Falkenberg, whom we have already quoted above, commences his second paragraph on philosophy since the death of Hegel (p. 448), with the remark: "The speculative impulse, especially in the mind of the German people, is ineradicable"; and any one who will compare the philosophical productiveness of Germany with that of other modern nations, even in these days of decline, will hesitate to minimize it by over-severe comparisons with the period of her philosophic greatness. Neither the disintegration of the post-Hegelian period, nor the failure of the attempts to restore her to the place of power by recourse to the influence of Kant, have sufficed to banish metaphysics from the field; until it may be doubted whether the cry, that philosophy in Germany is dead, is not, in part at least, to be ranged with those announcements of the disappearance of English metaphysic, which sometimes have been made, just as she was gathering strength for a new advance. Even the tendencies which have contributed to her decline include elements which must condition renewed development. If the study of philosophy in the universities has become merely a historical discipline, it must not be forgotten that one of the best safeguards of philosophical progress is a familiar acquaintance with the past; if metaphysics is limited to a discussion of the theory of knowledge, it is on the other hand true that just this formed Kant's point of departure, and, further, that it was suggested to him also by a determined attack on metaphysic from the sceptical side; if science has made inroads into the philosophical field, it cannot be overlooked that materialism has failed to carry the day, that the extreme theories of evolution have not found that reception in Germany which they enjoy in the land of their birth, that the study of pure science and the scientific psychology alike lead their followers in Germany, as in England, to the metaphysical problems which lie behind. The church is beginning to feel the need of something better than a merely negative theology. Ethical questions receive increased attention as the pressure of social problems increases, and with the development of a larger national life; and, while it would be rashness to predict any great speculative movement for the near future, yet it is not so certain as some writers believe, that the land is philosophically exhausted. It must be confessed, however, that the two greatest attempts of recent years in constructive metaphysics have failed of full success. Lotze's system did not realize its early promise,* and von Hartmann's does not attain a commanding position, notwithstanding its

* Cf. New Princeton Review, Vol. I., No. I., p. 147.

author's unwearied efforts, as well in his impassioned polemic,* as along the lines of more abstract thought. Nor can a name be cited giving promise of higher achievements. The labors and conflicts of the past fifty years have left many problems to be solved, many factors to be considered, by any philosophy destined to attain preëminent influence in German thought. But the philosophy fitted to meet the conditions has not yet appeared, nor the philosopher qualified to take his place by the great masters of the bygone days.

BOOKS RECEIVED,

Of which there may be critical notice hereafter.

BANCROFT.—*History of California.* Vol. V, pp. xv, 784. San Francisco, 1886: The History Company.
BARING-GOULD.—*Story of the Nations, Germany*, pp. xviii, 437. New York, 1886: Putnam.
DOSTOYEVSKY.—*Crime and Punishment*, pp. 456. New York, 1886: T. Y. Crowell & Co.
ELY.—*The Labor Movement in America*, pp. xvi, 373. New York, 1886: T. Y. Crowell & Co.
FORD.—*American Citizen's Manual.* Parts I. and II, pp. 144 and 184. New York, 1886: Putnam.
GODET.—*Commentary on the Gospel of St. John.* Vol. II, pp. x, 451. New York, 1886: Funk & Wagnalls.
GOGOL.—*St. John's Eve.* Translated by Isabel F. Hapgood, pp. 380. New York, 1886: T. Y. Crowell & Co.
HALE.—*Story of the Nations, Spain*, pp. xx, 407. New York, 1886: Putnam.
HUNT.—*Caedmon's Exodus and Daniel.* Edited from Grein, Second Edition, pp. 121. Boston, 1885: Ginn, Heath & Co.
LABBERTON.—*Historical Atlas and General History*, pp. xvi, 213. New York, 1886: Townsend MacCoun.
LEWIS.—*History of Sabbath and Sunday*, pp. 583. Alfred Centre, N. Y. 1886: American Sabbath Tract Society.
LIPSIUS.—*Theologischer Jahresbericht*, V. Band, pp. x, 566. Leipzig, 1886: Georg Reichardt.
LOTZE.—*Outlines of Æsthetics.* Translated and edited by George S. Ladd, pp. x, 113. Boston, 1886: Ginn & Co.
MACLAY.—*Budget of Letters from Japan*, pp. ix, 391. New York, 1886: Armstrongs.
PARTRIDGE.—*The Making of the Irish Nation*, pp. xxvi, 190. London, 1886: T. Fisher Unwin.
ROUX.—*Meditations of a Parish Priest.* Translated by Isabel F. Hapgood, pp. 213. New York, 1886: T. Y. Crowell & Co.
SPURGEON.—*Storm Signals*, pp. 422. New York, 1886: Carters.
WYMAN.—*Poverty Grass*, pp. 320. Boston, 1886: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

---

* Cf. von Hartmann's *Philosophische Fragen der Gegenwart*, Leipzig and Berlin, 1885.

RECORD.

POLITICS—Domestic.

THE ADMINISTRATION. — President Cleveland and his Cabinet have industriously followed out the Chief Executive's idea of a business Administration. The past six months have shown no change in the general policy of the Administration. The CONTEST WITH THE SENATE in regard to suspensions and nominations resulted in a practical victory for the President. The first decided concession was made early in April, when the Senate intimated that they would confirm certain nominees for places of suspended officials whose legal terms had expired since their suspension, provided the President withdrew the nomination, and then sent it to the Senate as a new nomination. Soon after, the Senate confirmed Mr. Barnett as MR. DUSKIN'S SUCCESSOR in the office of District Attorney for Alabama. This was the celebrated test case, and the Edmunds' Resolutions were thus wholly set aside. Up to May 15, the President had made about 2,100 nominations, of which 1,700 had been confirmed, and only 13 rejected; and when Congress adjourned, the rejections did not amount to one per cent. of the nominations, a smaller percentage than under any Republican Administration. The whole contest led to a movement for OPEN EXECUTIVE SESSIONS of the Senate, which was supported by prominent Senators of both parties. It is believed that the movement will be eventually successful.— The ATTITUDE OF THE ADMINISTRATION TOWARD THE NEGROES was shown by the nomination of Mr. Matthews (colored) of Albany, to be Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia. Strong opposition to him was developed on the ostensible ground that he was not a resident of the district, and the Senate rejected the nomination. President Cleveland then renominated him for the office, and, in a private letter to a negro who congratulated him on his action, said: "I very much hope that this act will not be regarded as in any way defiant to the Senate, or as an attempt to appear heroic. I have deemed the question involved in this matter as one rising above politics, and as offering a test of good faith and adherence to pledges —nothing more or less. . . . If the colored man is worthy of a promise, he is absolutely entitled to its fulfilment by every honorable man. I am glad you are pleased, but fail to see how I am entitled to especial credit for being honest."—The POLICY of the Administration TOWARD THE INDIANS was shown by the President's veto, on July 7, of a bill granting to railroads the right of way through the Indian Reservation in Northern Montana. He said, of the bill: "It ignores the right of Indians to be consulted as to the disposition of their lands. It invites a general invasion of the Indian country." — The conservative FINANCIAL POLICY of Secretary Manning has been pursued during the past six months. Several large bond calls have recently been issued, it being deemed possible to reduce the surplus without inducing a silver panic. Secretary Manning resigned his office on June 5, but at the President's request took a leave of absence until October 1, in the hope that his health might then be fully restored. He resumed his work in the second week of October.— Other acts of the Administration will be found under the subdivisions which follow.—President Cleveland, on June 2, was married to Miss Frances Folsom of Buffalo.

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM. — The Civil-Service Commission, as fully reorganized about April 1, consists of Messrs. Oberly and Edgerton, Democrats, and Mr. Lyman, Republican. They have been diligent in their work and ardent friends of the cause. The suspicions against Mr. Oberly on account of his previous record as an active politician have proved groundless, as he has been one of the most zealous members of the Commission. On July 1, a new rule of the Commission went into effect, by which on the first Thursday of July, in each year, every Customs-district Board and Post-office Board shall nominate one of its members for appointment as Chairman and one for appointment as Secretary of the Board. The Commission reserved the right to approve the nominations or make others. One of the first results of this rule was the displacement of the Republican Chairman and Secretary of the New York Custom-house Board by Democrats. The general working of the rule, however, will, it is believed, be salutary. Another step forward was taken in July, when the Commission forbade the appointment of the private secretary of an appointing or nominating officer, or the officer who in the absence of an appointing or nominating officer acts in his place, to be chairman or secretary of an examining board, because the confidential relations existing between them might lead to appointments on other grounds than merit. The

New York Custom-house had been for months the one conspicuous exception to the uniform observance of the Civil-Service Law in federal offices. Collector Hedden boldly violated the spirit of the law, and was daily making of his office a political machine. In the latter part of July the Civil-Service Commission made an investigation, which resulted in the RESIGNATION OF MR. HEDDEN. The President, on August 10, appointed in his place Daniel Magone of Ogdensburg, N. Y., a widely-known lawyer in Northern New York. He was the President's personal choice, and was expected to carry out the letter and spirit of the Civil-Service Law, and take no part in New York city politics. He has so far fulfilled these expectations.—AN ORDER was issued by the Commission, in August, requiring the Secretary of each Board of Examiners to submit his eligible register and certification-book to the Board at each regular monthly meeting. The Board is to see that the secretary has complied with the law governing the making of appointments. The monthly report of the local board to the Commission must include copies of all certifications made during the month, the standing of each person certified for appointment, and a full statement of the circumstances in each case.—A PLAN OF PROMOTION has been prepared by the Commission for submission to the President, for introduction in the Departments at Washington. It provides for examinations and certifications similar to the tests for entrance to the service.—President Cleveland, about the middle of July, issued an order to the heads of departments WARNING ALL OFFICE-HOLDERS under the general Government against the use of their official positions in attempts to control political movements in their localities. The order said: "Office-holders are the agents of the people, not their masters. . . . They have no right, as office-holders, to dictate the political action of their associates, or to throttle freedom of action within party lines by methods and practices which prevent every useful and justifiable purpose of party organization." The order was frequently violated during the summer and autumn campaign.—The appointment by the President, in August, of William H. Webster to be CHIEF EXAMINER for the Civil-Service Commission, was another indication of the earnestness of the Chief Executive in regard to the reform. Mr. Webster is a Republican, and has been Chairman of the Departmental Board of Examiners.—THE HOSTILE ATTITUDE of a large element of the Democratic party in Congress toward Civil-Service Reform manifested itself on many occasions. The Democratic majority of the House Committee on Appropriations voted to add, in the Legislative Appropriation Bill, to the item for salaries and expenses of the Civil-Service Commission, the following proviso: "That this appropriation shall be available only when the rules of the Civil-Service Commission are so framed as that the names of all applicants for official appointment from any one State, found duly qualified on examination, and without regard to age, shall be sent to the head of a department or other officer charged with making an appointment." The item for the salaries of the 150 pension examiners now appointed under the Civil-Service rules contained the proviso, that they should be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, on the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions. Mr. Randall, of the Appropriation Committee, also threatened that there should be no appropriation to pay the rent of the rooms which Secretary Lamar had provided for the Commission.—A VIGOROUS DEBATE on the "rider" to the Legislative Bill, which aimed to nullify the Civil-Service Law, began in the House on June 9. Mr. Compton (Dem., Md.) attacked the law as unconstitutional, while Mr. Findlay (Dem.) made a strong speech in favor of Civil-Service Reform, and did not spare his Democratic associates who opposed it. Mr. Bayne (Rep., Pa.) made a remarkable speech, in which he asserted his belief that the President and his Cabinet were endeavoring faithfully to execute the law. Finally, on June 12, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Blount (Dem., Ga.), ruled out the "rider" on the ground that the jurisdiction of that subject belonged to the Civil-Service Committee, and not to the Committee on Appropriations; and moreover, the "rider" was out of order because it changed existing law. The whole tenor of the debate made it evident that there was a large element in both parties opposed to the reformed civil service, but that there was a decided majority which could be relied upon to defeat any measure which aimed to thwart or destroy the new system. This majority was made up of those who really believed in the reform, and those who feared to defy public opinion.—In the Senate, Mr. Vance (Dem.) of North Carolina introduced a BILL TO REPEAL THE CIVIL-SERVICE LAW. On June 18, it was indefinitely postponed by a vote of 33 to 6. The negative votes were Senators Berry, Call, Eustis, Harris, Jones of Nevada, and Vance. Eight Democrats voted in the affirmative. Democratic Senators again showed their CONTEMPT FOR THE REFORM on July 2, during the discussion of an amendment to the Legislative Appropriation Bill, providing for an additional clerk for the Civil-Service Commission. Senators Vance, Saulsbury, and Voorhees ridiculed the Civil-Service Law. Nevertheless, the amendment was adopted by 34 to 11.—The enemies of reform, during a discussion of the Sundry Civil Bill in the House on June 24, attempted to prevent the application of the Civil-Service Rules to the clerks in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, but were defeated by a vote of the

Committee of the Whole.—At the annual meeting of the NATIONAL CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM LEAGUE in Newport, on August 4, resolutions were adopted praising the sincerity and courage of the President, and asking him to extend the application of the Civil-Service Rules to the District of Columbia, and to the Postal Mail Service, Mint Service, clerical force in the Indian Service, and to the other offices where a smaller number of clerks than 50 are employed. The Senate was asked thereafter to consider nominations in open session. The League also recommended the repeal of the four years' tenure of office.—The annual meeting of the NEW YORK CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM ASSOCIATION was held on May 6. Mr. George William Curtis was reëlected president. He suggested that as a practical measure the Association should do all in its power to effect the repeal of the four years' tenure-of-office law. The President would be relieved of much pressure from those continually asking change of office.—IN MASSACHUSETTS the cause of Civil-Service Reform was seriously threatened by the Legislature passing an act exempting ex-soldiers from the provisions of the Massachusetts Civil-Service Act. Governor Robinson did the cause a great service when, on June 21, he vetoed the bill. He received the praise of the better element of the press of both parties. The Legislature refused to pass the bill over his veto.

THE LABOR QUESTION.—By the end of April the great strike on the GOULD SOUTHWESTERN RAILWAY system was completely ended, and resulted in a victory for the company. Mr. Hoxie, the Vice-President of the Missouri Pacific, refused in any way to recognize the demands of the Knights of Labor, but told them that their applications for work would be received and acted upon individually. Serious disorders continued for some time at the railway yards in East St. Louis, Ill., owing to the political cowardice of Governor Oglesby of Illinois, in refusing the demand for troops until much damage had been done. The General Executive Board of the Knights issued an order formally declaring the strike at an end on May 4. Many of the strikers on that day applied for work and were accepted, though those who committed depredations were refused employment. Three participants in the strike were convicted of conspiracy at Parsons, Kan., and sentenced, on June 25, to pay a fine of $100 and be imprisoned thirty days. Martin Irons, the leader of the strike, is now in jail awaiting trial. THE EIGHT-HOUR MOVEMENT.—On May 1, in many cities, the movement for eight hours as a day's labor was actively carried out. It was strongest in Chicago, where about 40,000 men quit work. Serious disorders ensued, and there were frequent encounters between the mobs and the police. Many firms yielded to the demands of the men, after compromising on eight hours' work and eight hours' pay. The most serious incident of the strike was THE ANARCHIST DEMONSTRATION of May 4 at Desplaines and Randolph Sts., Chicago. About 1,400 people had gathered to hear speeches denouncing the shooting of rioters by the police on the previous day. An Anarchist leader, Sam Fielden, became so violent in his utterances that a body of 125 police marched to the place. Suddenly a dynamite bomb was thrown among them and 33 policemen were cut down, 7 of them fatally wounded. The remaining officers fired round after round into the mob. More than 50 of them fell, and the rest hurried away. This outrage aroused the city and whole country to the dangerous Anarchist element, which had heretofore confined itself principally to violent talk. In Chicago the detectives and police went actively to work, and soon discovered that the fatal demonstration had been the result of a carefully planned conspiracy. Spies, Fielden, and Schwab, three noted Anarchist leaders, were arrested on May 5. A number of dynamite bombs were found in various parts of the city, and many more arrests were made. Twenty-two Anarchists were indicted by the grand jury on May 27, a number of them for murder. A long and exciting trial resulted, on August 20, in the CONVICTION OF SEVEN ANARCHISTS OF MURDER, the jury fixing the penalty at death. They are August Spies, Schwab, Fielden, Parsons, Fischer, Engel, and Lingg. The evidence showed a deliberate conspiracy to destroy life. The verdict gave great satisfaction throughout the country. On October 7 the motion for a new trial was denied, and the men will be hanged on December 3. —IN OTHER CITIES the movement was less extensive, though Milwaukee would have suffered severely had it not been for the remarkable firmness and PROMPT ACTION OF GOVERNOR RUSK. A mob of 7,000 idle workmen gathered at Bay View on May 4, threatening the rolling-mills. The Governor immediately ordered out the militia and ordered them to shoot. The mob quickly dispersed. A number of prominent Knights of Labor were arrested. Governor Rusk's action has been heartily approved by his unanimous renomination, by the Republicans, for a third term as Governor of Wisconsin.—In New York city, John Most, Adolph Schenck, and Richard Braunschweig, Anarchist agitators, were arrested on the charge of unlawful assembly and inciting to riot, tried in the Court of General Sessions, and convicted on May 28. Most was sentenced to one year in the Penitentiary and $500 fine. The others received lighter sentences. RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE PRESIDENT. — The widespread labor troubles led the President, on April 22, to send a message to Congress on the subject, in which he said: "In my opinion the proper theory upon which to proceed is that

of voluntary arbitration as the means of settling these difficulties. But I suggest that, instead of arbitrators chosen in the heat of conflicting claims, and after each dispute shall arise, there shall be created a Commission of Labor, consisting of three members, who shall be regular officers of the Government, charged, among other duties, with the consideration and settlement, when possible, of all controversies between labor and capital." He suggested that the Commission could easily be engrafted on the existing Labor Bureau by the addition of two more commissioners. They should be given power to investigate all labor disputes as they occur, whether submitted for arbitration or not. A bill in accordance with the President's recommendations was introduced in the House on April 26. THE BOYCOTT.—A severe blow was dealt the boycott by the arrest in New York city of a number of "walking delegates" on the charge of conspiracy. On April 15 four men were fined for disturbing the peace by distributing boycotting circulars against the bakery of Mrs. Gray. The people also took up the cause of Mrs. Gray and another boycotted baker, Mrs. Landgraf, and by generous contributions enabled them to resist the Union. Six of the Landgraf boycotters were convicted and sentenced on July 8. Another blow at the boycott was the sentence, on July 2, by Judge Barrett, of the THEISS BOYCOTTERS of this city to terms of imprisonment ranging from one year and six months to three years and eight months. The judge said: "Your offence is not short of blackmail. The distribution of circulars by you in places of business is conspiracy, and punishable as such."—Judge Sloan, of Milwaukee, during the trial in June of Robert Schilling, State organizer of the Knights, for conspiracy, practically ruled that, since Schilling had threatened to put the vast machinery of the Knights in motion to prevent the public from patronizing a boycotted firm, he had injured their income, which was as much property as machinery or buildings, and that to attempt to dictate to them whom to employ or discharge was a parallel offence. Schilling was convicted.—The movement against the boycott took the form in the West of a LAW AND ORDER LEAGUE, the principal objects of which are to assist the authorities in maintaining the law, and to support all persons who have been boycotted by the Knights of Labor or kindred organizations.—A long secret circular was issued in May, by MASTER WORKMAN POWDERLY, to all the Knights of Labor, deprecating all boycotting except that on drink. He said: "If boycott notices are sent to you, burn them. I have in my possession 400 boycott notices which were sent to assemblies with the request that they be acted upon. In fact, our order has been used as a tail for a hundred different kites, and in future it must soar aloft free from all of them. I hate the word boycott. If the men who possess money enough to buy guns and dynamite would invest it in the purchase of some well-selected work on labor, they would put the money to good use. They will never need the guns or dynamite in this country."—At a meeting of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR, in May, a report on the LAND QUESTION was unanimously adopted, demanding that all public land shall be held for settlers only; that all railroad and other land grants which have not been earned shall revert to the Government; that after 1890 all lands in the United States, the titles to which are vested in aliens, shall be taken possession of by the Government under the right of eminent domain, by purchase, at a fair valuation, to be fixed by appraisement; that after 1886 no alien shall be permitted to acquire the title to land either by purchase or in any other way; and that Congress shall pass a law abolishing all property qualifications for the exercise of the elective franchise. The Knights also ask of the States to provide for a graduated income tax. The Tenth Annual Convention of the Knights met in Richmond, Va., on October 4. Mr. Powderly made an address in which he advised every Knight to aid in creating a healthy public sentiment on the labor question. Some agitation of the color-line question was caused by the exclusion of a negro Knight from a hotel.

THE WORK OF CONGRESS. — The first session of the Forty-ninth Congress closed on August 5, after an unusually fruitless period of legislation. During the session there were introduced 10,013 House bills and 2,886 Senate bills; most of these were of a private and unimportant nature. Although at the beginning of the session six of the appropriation bills had been taken away from the regular Appropriation Committee, with a view to hasten the work by dividing it, yet of the fourteen appropriation bills only one became a law before the last day of the fiscal year (June 30). This was due more to the dilatoriness of Congress in considering the bills than to delay in reporting them. In summing up the financial work of Congress on August 4, Senator Allison stated that the TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS for the fiscal year 1886–'87 were $264,783,579, or about $33,000,000 more than for the previous fiscal year, of which increase $16,000,000 was added to the pension roll and $14,000,000 for rivers and harbors. The permanent appropriations of the Government, including the sinking fund, aggregate $118,910,000; excluding the sinking fund, $72,000,000. Therefore, the total annual appropriation is in round numbers $337,000,000.—The principal acts of national importance which became laws some time after April 1 were the following: THE OLEOMARGARINE BILL.—It imposes a tax on the manufacturer, wholesale dealer, and re-

tailer, and an additional tax of 2 cents per pound on all oleomargarine manufactured and sold, provision being made for the proper stamping and labelling of every package, with penalties for its violation. As originally proposed the tax was 5 cents per pound. The House passed it on June 3, by 177 to 101. The Senate, on July 20, passed the bill, after reducing the tax to 2 cents, by 37 to 24, all the negative votes but one being Democratic. The House concurred in the Senate amendments, and the bill was signed by the President on August 2. He explained that he signed the bill reluctantly, and not as protective or class legislation, but as incidentally a defence to the consumer against imitation butter. The bill goes into effect ninety days from its approval.—INCREASE OF THE NAVY. An act was passed appropriating $3,500,000 to complete four monitors and begin two iron-clad war ships, one more steel unarmed cruiser, and torpedo boats.—LAND GRANTS FORFEITED. An act was passed forfeiting the land grant of the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad where it is contiguous with the uncompleted portions of the road. Also forfeiting grants to minor railroads in Alabama and Mississippi which have not been built.—CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY. There was appropriated $1,050,000 to buy the land and begin construction of a Congressional Library building.—AMENDING THE SHIPPING ACT OF 1884. This law abolishes the fees charged by customs officers for measuring ships, certifying to manifests, recording bills of sale, etc.—MISCELLANEOUS. Among the other bills which became laws were the act allowing the President to nominate FITZ-JOHN PORTER to be colonel in the army, and at his discretion to put him on the retired list; the bill reducing from 8 to 5 cents the fee on domestic money-orders not exceeding $5; winding up the business of the Court of Alabama Claims; providing for the sale of the Cherokee reservation in Arkansas; providing for the incorporation of national trades unions; a resolution directing the Commissioner of Labor to investigate the subject of convict labor.—THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL, as finally passed and approved by the President on the recommendation of Gen. Newton, Chief of Engineers, appropriates $14,473,900. There has been no appropriation since 1885.—BILLS VETOED. More than one hundred acts of Congress failed because of the Presidential veto. About ninety of these were private PENSION BILLS. The President's messages on these were very caustic, exposing the hollow pretences on which the claims had been granted, after having been rejected by the Pension Bureau. The President held that the lawfully constituted authority to settle pensions should be allowed, except in rare instances, to decide private claims. Only one or two of these bills were passed over the veto. It is notable that more than 600 of these bills were approved by the President. Among the PUBLIC ACTS VETOED were the Des Moines River Lands Bill; the bill to make Springfield, Mass., a port of entry; the bill to grant a railroad right of way through the Indian reservation in Montana, and a number of bills for public buildings.—THE SURPLUS RESOLUTION. A joint resolution was passed by the House providing for the forced call of bonds whenever the surplus exceeded $100,000,000. As passed by the House, it was obligatory for the Secretary of the Treasury to issue the bond calls, but the Senate modified it so that the President could suspend the calls, and otherwise freed it of its objectionable features, making it in effect advisory. The resolution, however, failed, because not approved by the President before Congress adjourned.—BILLS PASSED BY THE SENATE ALONE. The Senate passed bills to indemnify the Chinese Rock Springs victims, and making the Chinese Restriction Act more stringent, but the House failed to act on them. THE BLAIR EDUCATION BILL, appropriating $77,000,000 for aid to the States, was passed by the Senate and killed by a substitute in the House. THE BANKRUPTCY BILL also failed in the House after passing the Senate, as did the Presidential Count Bill, the Edmunds Bigamy Bill, the Admission of Dakota Bill, the Blair Pension Bill, and the Interstate Commerce Bill.—BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSE ALONE. The Mexican Pension Bill, the Reagan Commerce Bill, and the Northern Pacific Land Grant Bill.—Both houses passed bills against ALIEN LANDLORDS in the Territories, but they were not the same, and therefore failed.—SILVER COINAGE. The bill for the free coinage of silver was defeated in the House on April 8, by 126 to 163. Of the affirmative votes 97 were Democrats and 29 Republicans; of the negative, 70 were Democrats and 93 Republicans.

TARIFF REFORM.—In order to carry out the pledges of the Democratic Party for revenue reform, MR. MORRISON (Dem., Ill.) and his Committee of Ways and Means prepared an elaborate bill reducing the tariff and putting a number of articles on the free list. On June 18 Mr. Morrison moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the revenue bills, his purpose being to call up the Tariff Bill. The motion was defeated, yeas, 140, to nays, 157. The affirmatives were 136 Democrats and 4 Republicans; the negatives 122 Republicans and 35 Democrats. It is apparent that the 35 Democratic votes put an effectual bar even to the discussion of a measure of tariff reform. For effect in the fall congressional campaign MR. RANDALL introduced on June 28 a bill to reduce and equalize duties on imports, to reduce internal revenue taxes, and to modify the laws in relation to the collection of revenue. It was a measure of sham

reform, constructed on protectionist lines, and was not intended for serious consideration. The Ways and Means Committee reported it adversely. Mr. Morrison plainly showed that the object of the bill was to reduce revenues and not taxes. Exception was taken to the large proposed increase in the duties on woollens and cotton ties. It was also shown that the taxes on whiskey and tobacco were lowered, while the duties on the raw materials used by our manufacturers and on clothing were untouched or increased.

PROHIBITION.—The Temperance Movement has shown unusual activity during the past six months, and has become a very important factor in politics, threatening the supremacy of the Republicans in many Northern States, and seriously menacing the Democrats in the South.—In RHODE ISLAND on April 7, the Constitutional Amendment prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors was carried by a decisive majority.—The Prohibitionists entered upon an active campaign in NEW JERSEY by nominating Gen. Clinton B. Fisk for Governor on May 28.—In the OREGON ELECTION, in June, the Prohibitionists polled about 2,000 votes, contributing very materially to the election of a Democratic governor by about 1,800 majority.—Prohibition tickets were nominated in Maine, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Texas, and many other States. In many places legislative candidates were put in the field. The Prohibition vote in Maine, in September, showed a large increase.—ANTI-SALOON REPUBLICANS. Becoming alarmed by the serious defection likely to be caused by the Prohibition movement, the Republican party took measures to conciliate that element. On July 12 a largely attended conference of so-called Anti-Saloon Republicans was held in Boston. The call for the meeting was ostensibly by temperance men, but the conference was managed by active leaders of the Republican party, the object being to bring back to allegiance those who had voted for St. John. The Convention adopted a resolution that the question of constitutional prohibition should be submitted to the people of Massachusetts at the earliest possible day. Only forty-seven delegates attended the NEW YORK Convention of Anti-Saloon Republicans at Binghamton on September 7. Resolutions were adopted, aiming to pledge the party to submit a prohibition amendment to the people. The first NATIONAL CONVENTION OF ANTI-SALOON REPUBLICANS met in Chicago on September 16, 300 delegates being present. The resolutions adopted demanded from the Republican party a decided stand "as the friend of the home and the enemy of the saloon." They approved local option laws and the submission of constitutional amendments as the best measures to deal with the traffic, and asserted that the national Government should absolutely prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor in the Territories. The National Committee decided to do everything possible to get the party to commit itself to the temperance cause.

THE FISHERIES DISPUTE. — So long ago as December, 1885, President Cleveland, in his message to Congress, recommended that Congress provide for the appointment of a commission to settle with a similar commission from Great Britain "the entire question of the fishing rights of the two governments and their respective citizens on the coasts of the United States and British North America." This excellent advice was not heeded. Early in April Senator Frye of Maine sharply criticised the course of the State Department on the fisheries question, and its decision that American vessels were now bound by the provisions of the TREATY OF 1818. By this treaty the United States agreed not "to take, dry, or cure fish on or within three miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors" of British possessions in North America, with certain well-defined exceptions. The Canadian Government had announced its intention of vigorously enforcing this. The whole question became of urgent importance when, on May 7, the Gloucester, Mass., schooner *David J. Adams* was seized by the Canadian cruiser *Lansdowne*, at Digby, N. S., charged with purchasing bait within the forbidden limits. The Secretary of State immediately ordered an investigation of the seizure to be made through our consular officers. The Canadians pointed out that the Treaty of 1818 expressly stated that American fishing-vessels could only enter the limits to seek shelter, repair damages, and obtain wood and water, and "for no other purpose whatever." The captain of the *Adams* denied having purchased any bait while in Digby "for fishing in British waters," and also the allegation that he had endeavored to conceal the schooner's identity by covering her name with canvas. It was also asserted that the schooner did not have the necessary permit to "touch and trade." The seizure created intense indignation in New England, which was reflected in Congress by New England representatives. The feeling was intensified when, on May 17, the fishing-schooner *Ella M. Doughty*, of Portland, Me., was seized at Englishtown, N. S., for buying bait on a permit from the Portland Custom-house to touch and trade. By way of RETALIATION the schooner *Sisters*, of Yarmouth, N. S., was seized at Portland, Me., on May 24, for failing to have a manifest, and was fined $500. The captain disclaimed any intention of violating the law, and on May 29 the schooner was released by order of the Treasury Department. Canada meanwhile was taking measures to enforce her interpretation of the treaty more vigor-

ously than ever. A squadron of six steamers and six schooners was fitted out, and instructed to protect the inshore fisheries against all encroachments. Nevertheless it was asserted on good authority that the Canadian fishermen were all anxious to sell bait to the Americans, as it is their main source of income. In Congress there was immediately introduced an AMENDMENT TO THE SHIPPING BILL, authorizing the President to exclude the vessels of any country "from the exercise of such commercial privileges in the ports of the United States as are denied to American vessels in the ports of such foreign country"; and making the vessel liable to seizure, and any one opposing the enforcement of the act liable to a fine of $800 and imprisonment for not more than two years. The bill and amendment were speedily passed, and signed by the President on June 19. The Canadians relaxed their vigilance somewhat in July, and by the middle of August the people of the maritime provinces began to complain that Americans were taking fish with impunity in Canadian waters. However, the American schooner *Highland Light* was seized on September 1, near East Point, Prince Edward Island, for fishing inside the limit. And on September 10 the *Everett Steele* put into Shelburne, N. S., for shelter, and was seized for having been in that port three months before for a few hours without reporting at the Custom-house. She was, however, released on the following day by orders from Ottawa. THE INSTRUCTIONS NOW IN FORCE in regard to seizures are that a foreign fishing-vessel within the limit is to be served with a warning, and if she is found fishing, preparing to fish, or hovering within the three-mile limit and does not depart within twenty-four hours after receiving the warning, an officer is to be placed on board and the facts telegraphed to the Fishery Department at Ottawa, and instructions awaited. NEGOTIATIONS in regard to the dispute were carried on between the State Department and British Minister at Washington, and the British Foreign Office and Minister Phelps in London. The brief of Minister Phelps' argument before the British Foreign Secretary, which was warmly approved by Secretary Bayard, claims that the seizures of the schooners *David J. Adams* and *Ella M. Doughty* were not legal acts; and the release of the vessels or the suspension of proceedings against the vessels' masters or owners, together with the payment of damages, was demanded. The United States will not yield the point that the three-mile limit is a distance of three marine miles from the shore at the point where the vessel may happen to be. The United States insists that the fines imposed were excessive, and not in accordance with international courtesy. The diplomatic negotiations still [October 7] continue.—SEIZURE OF BRITISH SEALERS. Another phase of the fisheries dispute was the seizure, by the United States revenue cutter *Corwin*, of British sealers in Alaskan waters. Three British schooners were seized on August 1 and 2, on the ground that the United States has jurisdiction over all the Alaskan waters described in the treaty of cession. It was after repeated complaints that a large number of vessels were engaged in the seal fisheries, that the *Corwin* was ordered to cruise in search of the offenders. The Alaska Fur Company pay the Government $317,000 for the lease of these fisheries. Several American vessels were also seized. The officers were sentenced to fines and imprisonment ranging from $500 to $300, and from sixty to thirty days.

THE CUTTING INCIDENT.—There was considerable warlike talk in Texas, during the latter part of July, because Mr. Cutting, the editor of a paper at El Paso, Texas, and an American citizen, was arrested at Paso del Norte, Mexico, and confined in prison without even the privilege of bail. Cutting heaped abuse on Emilio Medina, a Mexican Spaniard, through the columns of a Spanish paper in Paso del Norte. Afterward he made a retraction, but repeated his charges in the columns of his El Paso paper. The Mexicans assert that he circulated these papers freely in Paso del Norte, while Cutting asserts that he only took one copy of the paper in his pocket when he went over to the Mexican city. He denied the jurisdiction of the Mexican court when arrested, and would not accept counsel, saying that he appealed to the American Government. A great deal of ill-feeling resulted between Americans and Mexicans on the border. Governor Ireland, of Texas, made several very injudicious appeals to the Federal Government, which were not calculated to allay the ill-feeling of the indignant Texans. On August 2, Secretary Bayard sent to Congress the correspondence of the State Department in the case. It showed that the Secretary had made an IMMEDIATE DEMAND FOR THE RELEASE OF CUTTING, and was answered that Cutting was being tried for a violation of a Mexican federal statute, which provides for the punishment of a foreigner who in a foreign country commits an offence against a Mexican citizen. The Secretary of State replied that our Government could not tolerate the application of such a law to an American citizen, and renewed the demand for Cutting's release, which was not complied with. THE TRIAL OF CUTTING at Paso del Norte resulted, on August 5, in his conviction and sentence to one year's imprisonment at hard labor and a fine of $600. His case was appealed to the Supreme Court of the State, and the appeal granted. Mr. Cutting was convicted under Mexican law of a repetition of a libel first published in Mexico, and reprinted more virulently in a Texas paper which he distributed in Mexico.

It was the distribution in Mexico of the second libel, and not the printing of it in Texas, for which he was convicted, the libel having been read by three or more persons, as required by the law of the State of Chihuahua. Being uncertain as to the facts in the case, Secretary Bayard sent MR. ARTHUR G. SEDGWICK (a capable lawyer, writer, and student of international law) to Mexico, as a special agent to investigate the affair. Mr. Sedgwick visited the city of Mexico, Paso del Norte, and El Paso, Texas. The report which he made to the Secretary of State in September has not [October 7] been made public. Mr. Sedgwick was the victim of malice and slander, which circulated in this country vile reports as to his personal conduct while in the city of Mexico. These he has positively denied. CUTTING WAS RELEASED from prison on August 23, the Supreme Court of Mexico holding that as Medina, whom he libelled, refused to prosecute him civilly, his imprisonment before the trial had been punishment enough. Mexico, does not, however, withdraw its claim to the right to try an American citizen in that country for a crime committed in the United States. That the episode has not been without GOOD RESULTS is already shown by the order issued to the Mexican State officials by President Diaz, directing them, hereafter, in the case of the arrest of a foreigner for any cause, to remit to the central Government as soon as possible a detailed report of the causes for action or legal process, and of the status of the same. A better feeling now prevails along the border. Most of the agitation was caused by the worst element in both countries.—THE ARRESURES CASE. Another unpleasant incident on the Mexican border was the unlawful arrest, at Eagle Pass, Texas, of Francisco Arresures, on a trumped-up charge of horse-stealing, his immediate delivery to the Mexican authorities, and his summary execution by them. It is believed that the whole affair grew out of the personal enmity of Mondragon, a Mexican Captain of State Rangers, toward Arresures. The latter appealed to the American consul at Piedras Negras, Mexico, for protection, on July 27, and the latter at once demanded his return to Texas, on the ground that he had been kidnapped. The demand was refused, and at one o'clock at night Arresures was taken from the jail and brutally murdered by three of Mondragon's troops. The Texas officers who took part in the illegal arrest were summarily dealt with by Governor Ireland. The case is still the subject of negotiations between Mexico and the United States.

BRITISH EXTRADITION TREATY.—A supplementary treaty to that of 1842 has been negotiated by the governments of Great Britain and the United States, but has not been ratified by the Senate. It adds to the extraditable crimes, manslaughter, burglary, embezzlement, or larceny involving $50 or upwards, and malicious destruction of property which endangers the life of others, and which in either country is made a crime by law. This last refers to the crimes of dynamiters. The treaty exempts from extradition persons who have been convicted of purely political offences. It is not retroactive, and can be terminated at the pleasure of either contracting party.

JAPANESE EXTRADITION TREATY.—An extradition treaty with Japan, signed on April 29, 1886, was sent to the Senate on June 9, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Among the provisions objected to by the Committee is that providing for the detention for two months of a criminal whose extradition has been demanded by telegraph. This time-limit is not thought sufficiently liberal for a country so distant as Japan. The treaty will be taken up at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

THE TELEPHONE SCANDAL.—Before the Committee investigating the Telephone scandal, Attorney-General Garland testified in April that he had never used his official position to promote the interests of the Pan-Electric Company, and had no conversation with any person connected with the Interior Department as to the hearing in the Telephone Patent Case. The Committee, after a long investigation, submitted a report on June 30, signed by the Democratic members, which was in line with the following resolution, which was also introduced at that time: "*Resolved*, That a full, fair, and exhaustive investigation has failed to adduce any evidence which tends to show that Attorney-General Garland, Solicitor-General Goode, Secretary Lamar, Indian Commissioner Atkins, Railroad Commissioner Johnston, or Senator Harris (they being the officers named in the Pan-Electric publications of the newspaper press which gave rise to this investigation) did any act, official or otherwise, connected with the matter investigated, which was dishonest, dishonorable, or answerable." The Republican members of the Committee submitted a minority report of an exactly opposite tenor.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.—In accordance with an Act of Congress approved by President Arthur, the Court of Claims, on May 17, delivered its opinion as to the liability of the Government for the French Spoliation Claims. The unanimous opinion of the Court was that the claims are a valid obligation against this country, which sacrificed the rights of its individual citizens to secure a great national advantage. The Court showed that by the treaty of 1800 the Spoliation Claims were surrendered in consideration that the United States be released from any obligations to France under the treaties of 1778. This was the end of a long-standing grievance which had been

before Congress for many years. Two acts had previously been passed providing for the payment of the claims, but one was vetoed by President Polk and the other by President Pierce.

INDIAN AFFAIRS.—In April General Miles succeeded General Crook in command of the Department of Arizona, and announced that he would continue the pursuit of the hostile Apaches until all were killed or captured. As a result, on Sept. 4, Geronimo, Natchez, and their band of hostiles surrendered to Captain Lawton in the field, after a most arduous campaign. They were taken to San Antonio, Texas.—The Indian Commission has been very successful in the ALLOTMENT OF LANDS IN SEVERALTY to the Chippewa, Sioux, and Ute Indians.—For the coming fiscal year the Indian Commissioner estimates the expenses of all Indian agencies at $5,564,000. This includes an increase of $175,000 for Indian schools, but is almost two millions less than the estimates for 1886.

ELECTIONS.—Many of the States elect Governors and State tickets this fall, and an entire new House of Representatives is to be chosen. All the Democratic State Conventions have approved heartily of the Administration of President Cleveland, but some of them have dodged the Civil-Service Reform issue. The Republican platforms are remarkably free from the sectional issue, though it has been broached in several of them. Most of the elections will be held after the publication of this record.—ARKANSAS went Democratic on Sept. 6, by the usual majority, and VERMONT Republican by about 17,000. The movement against the re-election of Senator Edmunds was a complete failure.—After an unusually vigorous campaign by Mr. Blaine, the Republicans in MAINE elected their State ticket on Sept. 13 by 12,800 plurality. The Prohibitionist candidate for Governor polled 3,800 votes.

NEW YORK MUNICIPAL POLITICS.—The Broadway Railroad scandal resulted in the arrest of 15 aldermen of the Board of 1884 on the charge of bribery. The first one brought to trial was Henry W. Jaehne, who was convicted on May 16, and sentenced to 9 years and 10 months at hard labor in the State Prison. He was taken to Sing Sing. His case was taken to the Court of Appeals which, on October 5, handed down a decision affirming the sentence of the lower court. Four more of the indicted aldermen were arraigned on October 7. Their trial was to begin on October 18. The scandal resulted in the passage of bills by the New York Legislature REPEALING THE BROADWAY RAILROAD CHARTER and providing for winding up its affairs.—One of the best moves for the purification of the city's politics was the REMOVAL OF ROLLIN M. SQUIRE, Commissioner of Public Works. He was charged with mutilation of records, neglect of duty, failure to comply with the Civil-Service Law, and a corrupt and illegal bargain with Maurice B. Flynn, to conduct the Department as Mr. Flynn should dictate, and to resign the office when called upon to do so. Mr. Flynn is a contractor having large dealings with the city. An autograph letter of Mr. Squire's supported the last charge. After a fair hearing before Mayor Grace, the latter recommended to Governor Hill that Squire be removed, and the Governor approved. Gen. John A. Newton, late Chief of Engineers in the U. S. Army, was appointed to succeed Squire, and has already justified the appointment by his efficiency. Squire and Flynn have been indicted for conspiracy.—The factors of New York city politics have been considerably changed by the death of John Kelly, the noted Tammany leader, on June 1, and Hubert O. Thompson, the leader of the County Democracy, on July 26. At the time this RECORD closes the Mayoralty contest promises unusual complications. Mr. Henry George has been nominated as the Labor candidate, and Abram S. Hewitt as the Tammany and County Democracy candidate.

THE SOUTH. — Jefferson Davis emerged from his retirement in May to visit Montgomery, Ala., Savannah, Ga., and other Southern cities. He was greeted with enthusiasm by the Southern people, who paid him every kind of public honor. A close examination of the Southern Press showed that the demonstration was intended as a personal compliment and an affectionate farewell to their aged leader. The sentiments of the press and of the people were eminently loyal to the Union, and even Mr. Davis said: "Be it yours to fulfil all the obligations devolving upon all good citizens seeking to restore the general Government to its pristine purity, and as best you may, to promote the welfare and happiness of your common country." The incident has been generally accepted as the closing tableau in the drama of the Confederacy.

SAMUEL J. TILDEN. — The Democratic party lost one of its most distinguished leaders by the death, on August 4, of Samuel J. Tilden, at his country home, Greystone. He was seventy-two years of age. About $4,000,000 of his estate was bequeathed for public uses to three trustees. Mr. Tilden suggested the establishment of a great free library for New York city.

POLITICS—FOREIGN.

GREAT BRITAIN.—The question of Home Rule for Ireland passed beyond the domain of mere agitation and entered the boundaries of practical politics when, on April 8, Mr. Gladstone rose in the House of Commons and moved for permission to introduce a bill to amend previous legislation and to make provision for the future government of Ireland. The scenes in and around

the Parliament buildings on that day surpassed any similar event within the memory of living men. Since early morning members had filled the House in order to secure their seats. Great crowds, gathered outside, cheered the Premier from the moment he left his Downing Street residence till his arrival at the House. Inside, his greeting was equally enthusiastic. Almost immediately he rose to speak, and for three hours and twenty-five minutes addressed the House. It was a splendid intellectual and personal triumph. THE HOME RULE BILL, as he outlined it, contained the following significant features: It provided for an independent Irish Parliament, the duration of which was not to exceed five years. In it two Orders were to sit and deliberate together, with the right of voting separately on any occasion and on the demand of either body, which should be able to interpose a veto upon any measure for a limited time, either until the dissolution or for three years. The Orders would be constituted as follows: The twenty-eight representative Irish peers, now sitting in the House of Lords, were to withdraw when the Irish members left the House of Commons, and should have the option of sitting as members of the first Order in the new Irish Parliament. With them there should sit seventy-five representatives elected by the Irish people. The property qualification of these representatives was to be £200 annual value, or a capital of £4,000. Their constituents would be composed of occupiers of the value of £25 and upward, and they would be elected for ten years. These made the total of the first Order 103. The second Order would contain 206 members, including the 101 members of the Imperial House of Commons. The proposed Irish Parliament should not deal with subjects relating to the Crown; with the defence, army and navy, or foreign and colonial relations; nor should it have power to pass laws for the establishment or endowment of any particular religion. It was proposed to retain the Viceroy, but hereafter he was not to quit office with the outgoing Government. To him the Queen could delegate any of her prerogatives. The constabulary was to remain under its present authority. All expenditure for it in excess of £1,000,000 was to be met by the Imperial Exchequer. In outlining the measure Mr. Gladstone estimated the total annual expenditure to be made by the Irish Parliament, including a payment as a sinking fund for the Irish portion of the national debt, at £7,946,000. The total annual income he estimated at £8,350,000, leaving a surplus to the Irish Government of £404,000.—THE IRISH LAND PURCHASE BILL was propounded to the House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone on April 16. It was to go into effect on the same day on which the Home Rule Bill would become operative. The bill was very elaborate and intricate, and gave to Irish landlords the option to sell out their agricultural holdings under its provisions. The State authorities would purchase the land from the land-owner and put the peasant in possession as absolute proprietor, subject to an annual rental until the total payments equalled the purchase-money. Small occupiers should not be forced to become proprietors by the State. When a landlord desired to sell his property he should apply to the State authority, who would refer it to a Land Commission, which should fix a price. If the landlord objected to the price he might withdraw his application on paying the costs. The Land Commission might refuse applications for sale. The basis of prices would depend upon the rental for a fixed period, the judicial rental of 1845 and Griffith's Valuation being the standards. Twenty years' rental would be a normal purchase. Applications for sale would not be received after March 31, 1890. The expense of the purchases was to be met by the Imperial Government through the issue of new Irish consols, the total not to exceed £180,000,000 at 3 per cent. The bill only provided that £10,000,000 of the stock should be issued during 1887, and £20,000,000 each in 1888 and 1889. A GREAT PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE, lasting for two months, ensued. On the very night of the introduction of the Home Rule Bill Mr. Parnell impressively announced that, with minor modifications, the measure would be cheerfully accepted by the Irish people and their representatives, as a satisfactory solution of the long-standing dispute between the two countries. This placed the Irish party squarely on Mr. Gladstone's side. The keynote of the OPPOSITION WITHIN THE LIBERAL PARTY to its great leader was struck by Mr. Chamberlain, who took four principal objections to Mr. Gladstone's scheme—the first to the exclusion of Irish members from the Imperial Parliament, the second to renouncing the right of Imperial taxation, the third to the surrender of the appointments of judges and magistrates, and the fourth to the supreme authority given to the Irish Parliament in matters not specially excluded from its authority. Mr. Chamberlain looked for the solution of the Home Rule problem in the direction of federation. The Marquis of Hartington also made a moderate but determined speech, defining the attitude of the Liberal dissidents. He believed that if the scheme was good for Ireland it was good for Scotland and Wales, and if carried to its logical conclusion there would be a House of Parliament with every Irish, Scotch, and Welsh member excluded, acting as an Imperial Legislature for the whole United Kingdom. For the Tories Lord Randolph Churchill contended that the real principle of the bill was simply Repeal of the Union.—Other eminent Libe-

rals followed the Marquis of Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain in opposition to the Home Rule scheme. Mr. John Bright wrote: "It would be a calamity for the country if measures of the transcendent magnitude of Mr. Gladstone's should be accepted on the authority of any leader, however eminent." Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Goschen, Sir Henry James, Earl Selborne, and Lord Derby joined vigorously with the dissenting Liberals. The chief point in the Home Rule Bill condemned by them was the clause excluding Irish members from Westminster. The Land Purchase Bill was also generally condemned. During the EASTER RECESS, when the debate was transferred from the House of Commons to the various constituencies, Mr. Gladstone issued a manifesto to his Midlothian electors which seemed to indicate that he was ready to modify the Home Rule Bill and perhaps drop entirely the Land Purchase scheme. Mr. Chamberlain wrote that he would vote for the second reading of the Home Rule Bill "if Mr. Gladstone will maintain the Imperial Parliament as the supreme representative authority in the kingdom." The Council of the National Liberal Federation of Great Britain, which met on May 5, enthusiastically supported Mr. Gladstone. ON MOVING THE SECOND READING OF THE HOME RULE BILL, on May 10, Mr. Gladstone announced that, though abiding in the principle that the Irish members should not sit in the Imperial Parliament, the Government was willing to meet the difficulty by providing that when it was proposed to alter the taxation of Ireland relating to the customs and excise duties, Irish members would be enabled to appear in Parliament and share in the debate. The Government was also willing to appoint a joint commission from the English and Irish parliaments, which would meet from time to time to consider some questions of imperial or common interest. The announcement of this mild concession was heard in silence. Mr. Chamberlain had been led to believe that Mr. Gladstone would agree to retain the Irish members at Westminster, and the former was prepared to immediately make a speech accepting the terms. The whole scheme for a reunion of the Liberals was thus suddenly overthrown. Meetings of the followers of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington were held during that week, about sixty of the members of the House of Commons being present. It was unanimously voted to oppose the second reading of the Home Rule Bill. Another and FINAL EFFORT was made TO CONCILIATE the LIBERAL DISSIDENTS. A general meeting of the Liberal party was held on May 27. None of the Chamberlain-Hartington faction were present. Mr. Gladstone announced that the Government had decided to modify the clause of the Home Rule Bill excluding Irish members from Westminster, provided the bill passed its second reading and was referred to a select committee, for action during the autumn session of Parliament, or it might be amended and reintroduced at an early session in 1887. The modifications Mr. Gladstone was willing to submit embraced a plan entitling Irish representatives to be invited to attend the Imperial Parliament whenever proposals of taxation affecting Ireland were up for consideration; and also providing for a full Irish representation when the House had under discussion army and navy estimates, votes of credit for war purposes, foreign treaties, imperial excise and customs, and votes for the maintenance of the royal family. At a meeting of Mr. Chamberlain's party on May 31 it was voted to oppose the bill, notwithstanding these concessions; and on the following evening Mr. Chamberlain made a vehement speech, asserting that he could not support the bill because it weakened the authority of the Imperial Parliament. Amid great excitement the debate on the second reading of the Home Rule Bill was brought to a close on the evening of June 7. The Prime Minister was in splendid voice, and spoke for one hour and forty minutes. His peroration was most impassioned, and contained the following terrible INDICTMENT OF ENGLAND: "Go into the length and breadth of the world, ransack the literature of all countries, and find, if you can, a single voice, a single book—find, I would almost say, as much as a single newspaper article—in which the conduct of England toward Ireland is anywhere treated, except with profound and bitter condemnation." The vote was then taken, and resulted in the DEFEAT OF THE GLADSTONE GOVERNMENT by a majority of 30—341 voting against the measure, of whom 94 were Liberals and Radicals, and 311 for it, who were Gladstonians and Parnellites. On June 8 the Cabinet unanimously resolved to APPEAL TO THE COUNTRY. Queen Victoria asked Lord Hartington to form a Ministry, but he recommended a dissolution, and on June 9, the Queen gave her consent. THE DISSOLUTION was formally announced to the House on the following day. THE PARLIAMENTARY CAMPAIGN which immediately followed was unusually vigorous and bitter. Mr. Gladstone opened it with an address to the electors of Midlothian, sharply defining the issue as between his plan, that "Ireland should, under well-considered conditions, transact her own affairs," and Lord Salisbury's plan, "to ask Parliament to renew repressive laws and enforce them resolutely for twenty years." He followed it with a number of eloquent speeches in Edinburgh, Manchester, Liverpool, and elsewhere, in which he made the only issue the choice between a policy of conciliation or coercion, and admitted that the Home Rule Bill was dead. Mr. Chamberlain in his manifesto declared that the Gov-

ernment's Irish proposals had been condemned in advance by every Liberal statesman of the country, but in a later speech expressed the hope that the Liberal party might find itself in the autumn agreed upon some large measure for Home Rule and local government in Ireland. Lord Hartington, in his manifesto, contended that Parliament must continue to represent the whole, and not a part of the kingdom, and its powers should be delegated, not surrendered, to subordinate local bodies. Lord Randolph Churchill's manifesto took the form of a violent attack on Mr. Gladstone. Lord Salisbury asserted that he favored such a system of local government for England, Scotland, and Ireland as should be under the control of the central Government, and pass by-laws, not laws. John Bright wrote "No Irish Parliament can be so powerful or just as the United Imperial Parliament at Westminster." An incident of the campaign was Mr. Parnell's reiterated assertion, first made in the House of Commons, that in an interview with the Earl of Carnarvon, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in the Conservative Ministry, he was led to believe that a home-rule bill and a land purchase bill would be passed by the Conservatives with Irish votes before the end of that session. Lord Carnarvon and Lord Salisbury, on the other hand, vehemently asserted that the interview was entirely personal, and the sentiments expressed by the Earl of Carnarvon were in no sense representative of the Conservative Government. The elections, which continued almost throughout July, resulted in A GLADSTONIAN DEFEAT. The totals were Conservatives, 318; Unionists, 73: Liberals, 194; Parnellites, 85; or, Anti-Home-Rule, 391; Home Rule, 279. The popular vote resulted in an Anti-Home-Rule majority of about 335,000. in a total vote of nearly 5,000,000. Accordingly on July 20 the GLADSTONE CABINET RESIGNED. Lord Salisbury on July 26 formally assumed the task of making a ministry. Several of the prominent Liberal dissidents were offered places in it, but declined. As completed it contains only Conservatives. The most important posts are as follows: PRIME MINISTER and First Lord of the Treasury, the MARQUIS OF SALISBURY; Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons, Lord Randolph Churchill; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Marquis of Londonderry; Chief Secretary for Ireland, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach; Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Lord Iddesleigh; Home Secretary, Henry Matthews, Q. C. The last-named appointment created considerable surprise, though Mr. Matthews is one of the ablest men at the English bar. He had never held office before. It is said that he was appointed at Lord Randolph's dictation, on account of his abilities as a ready and forcible speaker. The Liberals were indignant at the selection of Lord Randolph as leader of the House, and the older Conservatives were not pleased.—A meeting of Liberal Unionists was held on August 5, at which Lord Hartington proposed that all attitude of hostility towards the adherents of the late Gladstone Government be abandoned. They should, however, oppose all proposals looking to the separation of the empire. He said the consolidation of the party was only a matter of time. Mr. Chamberlain expressed similar sentiments. A resolution was unanimously adopted, that the Radical and Whig Unionists should work together, and that the leaders who are privy councillors should claim seats in the House of Commons on an equality with the Gladstonite leaders. The Parnellites resolved that no measure offering less legislative and executive control over Irish affairs than Mr. Gladstone's bill should be accepted as a settlement.—THE NEW PARLIAMENT met on August 5, and reëlected Speaker Peel. Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain sat with Mr. Gladstone on the front Opposition bench. The House adjourned from August 10 to August 19, to allow the reëlection of Cabinet Ministers. On reassembling, the QUEEN'S SPEECH, which was very brief, was read. It said: "I abstain from recommending now for your consideration any measures except those which are essential to the conduct of the public service during the remaining portion of the financial year." Outlining THE TORY POLICY, Lord Randolph Churchill said that the Government had concluded that the adoption of coercive measures for Ireland would be unwise. The Ministry wished the question of local government to be treated as a question affecting the United Kingdom. When Parliament reassembled in February, they should present definite proposals on the question of local government for all three kingdoms. Regarding the land question, he said that the Government for the present would take their stand on the Land Act of 1881 as a final settlement, but would appoint a royal commission to inquire into the system. The Government took the verdict of the country in favor of maintaining the Union as final and irrepealable. The Parnellites immediately declared that they were not satisfied with this policy of delay. In the debate on the reply to the Queen's speech, Mr. Parnell said the Irish people would not be "bamboozled" into accepting crumbs, in the way of harbors of refuge, and artificial attempts to stimulate Irish manufacture, in place of their birthright of national self-government. Other Irish members made bold but discreet speeches. The Parnellites decided not to adopt a policy of organized obstruction. Mr. Chamberlain announced that he would not do anything toward turning out the Salisbury Government, so long as that likely to take its place was committed

to a separatist policy.—THE PARNELL LAND BILL. In order to provide a temporary measure of relief and prevent wholesale evictions in November, when rents become due, Mr. Parnell introduced, in September, a bill, the main feature of which was the suspension of evictions in Ireland on payment into court of half the rent due. The Irish Law Commission was to be the court to determine whether the relief should be granted in any individual case. There was also a provision for the admission of certain lease-holders to the benefits of the provisions of the Land Act of 1881. The Conservative Government refused to support the bill, Lord Randolph Churchill announcing that at the next session they would introduce a bill to facilitate the transfer of land. The Government also denied the necessity for immediate relief. Mr. Gladstone made a strong speech in favor of the bill, but it was defeated on its second reading, on September 21, by 202 to 297. All the Gladstonians voted with the Parnellites in the affirmative. Thirty-one Whig Unionists voted with the Tories in the negative. Mr Chamberlain's Radicals abstained from voting. The business of Parliament was then rapidly hastened, and it was PROROGUED on September 25 to November 11. During the closing debate on the Land Bill, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach hinted that the Government might call an early session of Parliament to pass a coercion bill. Lord Randolph Churchill made a speech on October 2, which is considered as a definite BURIAL OF KING JINGO and a declaration of the future Tory policy. He for the time put Ireland in the background, and said that the Government would give greater attention to Legislation affecting England and Scotland. It would introduce measures to enable farm laborers to obtain freehold allotments; for cheapening the cost of the transfer of land; and for a genuinely popular form of local government. He also hinted at free education. On all these points he had audaciously adopted the Liberal policy. The Tory press have upheld him, and he is apparently only opposed by the Jingoes. In regard to Bulgarian affairs, he said that England should support Austria.

DISORDERS IN IRELAND.—Serious rioting was begun in Belfast, by Orangemen, on June 9, and continued at intervals until October 1. The mobs were most violent, and more than 100 houses were wrecked. The Catholics retaliated in kind, and many on both sides were killed and wounded. The police repeatedly fired upon the mobs, and excited the ire of the Protestants, who declared that a conspiracy existed between the Catholics and police of Belfast. Similar disorder prevailed in Sligo and Londonderry. Lord Randolph Churchill was severely baited in Parliament with having incited the Orangemen to riot by his incendiary speeches during the campaign. In Kerry, many outrages were perpetrated by moonlighters, and the Salisbury Government sent a special military officer, Gen. Sir Redvers Buller, invested with powers to enable him to restore order. General Buller announced that he had not accepted a dragooning mission, nor would he assist in evictions. His task was simply to repress moonlighters and insure the safety of life and property.

CANADA.—The chief political event in Canada during the past six months has been the FISHERIES DISPUTE with the United States, which is fully outlined in the domestic division of this summary.—The official report of the Minister of Militia, which was presented to the Dominion Parliament on May 21, showed that the total cost of the half-breed rebellion had been $4,700,000. The casualties on the Canadian side were 26 men killed and 206 wounded.—ELECTIONS IN NOVA SCOTIA in June showed a popular majority of 12,000 in a vote of 60,000, in favor of secession from the Dominion of Canada.—AMNESTY was in July granted to all persons connected with the North-west rebellion, except those who committed homicide otherwise than in actual conflict.

BURMAH.—Owing to political confusion and disorder in Burmah ever since the British occupation, the Government decided in August to intrust the supreme command to Maj.-Gen. Sir Herbert Macpherson. Five thousand troops will be sent to restore order. THE AFGHAN FRONTIER.—The difference which for some time prevented the British and Russian members of the Afghan Boundary Commission from arriving at an agreement was settled in August. The English Commission started for home and a sensational report was spread abroad that they had been recalled. It was soon announced that they were returning because their work could easily be completed at home. ANNEXATIONS.—Great Britain has proclaimed a protectorate over the Ellice Islands in the South Pacific Ocean, and has taken possession of the Kermadec Islands.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.—The situation in the East, growing out of Prince Alexander's assumption of the Government of Rumelia and his victory over Servia, continued to be critical throughout the spring. Greece made warlike preparations, notwithstanding the frequent warnings of the Powers to desist. On April 21 an ultimatum was despatched to Greece by the Powers, intimating that they were in perfect accord in fixing a limit to the time within which she must disarm. France, however, refused to join the Powers in coercing Greece, but sent her Government a letter advising peace. Greece, in her reply to the ultimatum which ordered her to disarm within eight days, said that she would maintain her armaments, but gradually reduce them. This reply was deemed insufficient by the Ambassadors of

the Powers, who prepared to embark on the allied fleet. After much diplomatic controversy the Ministers finally left Athens on May 7, and Greek troops were hurried to the front, where the Turks were massing. The Greek Government announced its intentions of defending Greek territory against all advances by foreign soldiers. On the following day Germany, Austria, England, Russia, and Italy notified Greece that a blockade of her ports had been ordered. The Turkish cavalry had already advanced to the Greek border, and she was supposed to have 120,000 troops on the frontier—Greece about half that number. The commercial world became immediately excited over the blockade. The Greek Prime Minister, Delyannis, resigned with his Cabinet. Finally M. Valvis succeeded in forming a new Ministry, whose only duty it was to convoke the Chamber of Deputies. The Greek Government, coerced by the Powers, rescinded the order for the advance of troops to the front. The Chamber of Deputies met on May 20, and on the following day a new Ministry, with M. Tricoupis as Premier, was announced. This Ministry was peacefully inclined. Nevertheless a number of skirmishes between the Greeks and the Turks took place between May 20 and May 24. The new Ministry speedily issued orders for the disbanding of the army, and the trouble for the time was ended.

BULGARIA.—The whole Eastern question was suddenly reopened on August 22 by the forcible deposition of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria. According to his own account, about two o'clock in the morning the palace guard rushed into his sleeping apartment, thrust a revolver into his hand, and told him to save himself. The Prince hastened down-stairs, but was stopped by two soldiers with fixed bayonets. He therefore hurried back to his bed-chamber, in which he found a large number of officers, who advanced toward him with outstretched revolvers. One of them tore a page from a book and traced upon it some rapid, illegible words, while the others forced the poor Prince to a table, exclaiming: "Sign." Thus threatened by more than twenty revolvers, the Prince wrote "God protect Bulgaria. Alexander." After thus signing what was meant to be his abdication, the Prince was dragged off to the Ministry of War, whither his brother, Prince Francis Joseph, had already been taken. The two princes were taken to a cloister about twenty-five miles from Sofia, where the first night was spent. They were hurried off by steamer to Reni, in the Russian province of Bessarabia, where they arrived on August 25; thence Prince Alexander proceeded to Lemberg, Austria, where he arrived two days later. In the meantime two PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENTS were formed in Bulgaria, and a movement was started for Alexander's restoration. At Lemberg a delegation sent from the army and people of Bulgaria met him and invited him to reassume the reins of government. He embarked on the same yacht that conveyed him to Reni and crossed to Rustchuk, where the Metropolitan and other dignitaries awaited him. A body of officers crowned the Prince and carried him on their shoulders to the palace. He immediately issued a manifesto confirming measures adopted by the Regency which had been set up in his absence, with M. Stambuloff at its head. He thanked the people and the army for their fidelity and resolute attitude in favor of independence, and urged all to unite in promoting the welfare of Bulgaria. THE WHOLE PLOT of the Prince's kidnapping was evidently inspired by Russian agents, and the traitor soldiers who betrayed him and carried him out of the country said that each received twenty roubles, and was told that Alexander had entered into a plot to sell Bulgaria to the Turks. Russia began immediately to show her hand in diplomatic circles. M. de Giers said that Russia would not occupy Bulgaria while the country was tranquil, but Russia's position would be very delicate should Prince Alexander insist upon the execution of the men who led the revolt against him. On September 1, part of the Bulgarian revolutionary troops occupied the heights of Sofia, but were surrounded by the Loyalist troops, compelled to surrender and disarm. Zankoff, the Russian, who was the leading spirit in the revolution, was arrested, but his release was later ordered by Prince Alexander. THE JOURNEY OF THE PRINCE through Bulgaria to Sofia was a continued triumph. He reached Sofia on September 2, and on the following day the remainder of the revolutionary regiments surrendered unconditionally and appealed for clemency. Under the advice of Bismarck, it is said, Prince Alexander, on August 30, sent a very humble TELEGRAM TO THE CZAR, in which he said: "Having reassumed the government of Bulgaria, I venture to offer to your Imperial Majesty my most respectful thanks for the action of your consul at Rustchuk, whose official presence at my reception showed to the Bulgarians that Russia did not approve of the revolution—an act directed at my person. . . . I shall be happy to give your Majesty decided proofs of my unalterable devotion to your august person. Monarchical principle compelled me to restore the legality of my crown in Bulgaria and Rumelia. Russia having given me my crown, it is into the hands of Russia's sovereign I am ready to render it." The Czar replied to Prince Alexander as follows: "I cannot approve of your return to Bulgaria, foreseeing from it sinister consequences for the country already so tried. The mission of Prince Dolgoruki has become inexpedient. I shall abstain so long as your Highness remains in Bulgaria from

any intervention in the sad condition to which the country is reduced. Your Highness must decide your own course. I reserve to myself to judge what my father's venerated memory, the interests of Russia, and the peace of the East require of me." This reply created a sensation, as it indicated that Alexander must abdicate or fight. Accordingly, on September 4, Prince Alexander publicly announced his intention of ABDICATING THE THRONE OF BULGARIA. In an affecting address to the officers of the army, he said: "I cannot remain in Bulgaria, for the Czar will not permit me, because my presence is inimical to the country. I am forced to quit the throne. The independence of Bulgaria requires that I leave the country; if I did not Russia would occupy it."—On September 6 Stambuloff appeared at the Russian Consulate in Sofia and in the name of the Government demanded the name of the candidate for the Bulgarian throne whom Russia favored; a formal promise that Russia would not occupy Bulgaria; that the present Constitution be maintained and the freedom of Bulgaria respected; and, finally, that if Russia organized the army it must be under Bulgarian officers. These demands were telegraphed to St. Petersburg. The Czar replied, recognizing the regency of Stambuloff, Karaveloff, and Motkuroff, the union of Bulgaria and Rumelia, and the independence of the country. The Bulgarian Government asked the Powers to guarantee Russia's promise. Prince Alexander then went to his home in Darmstadt.—THE SOBRANYE, or National Assembly, met on September 13, and resolved to prolong the state of siege in Bulgaria, to court-martial the eighteen officers concerned in the kidnapping of the Prince, and praised Alexander for his self-abnegation and patriotism. An address was adopted, praying the Czar for protection over the liberty of the country. The Committee which investigated the *coup d'état* pronounced Karaveloff, Nikiforoff, and Zankoff jointly criminally responsible for the affair. In September the Czar sent a special agent, GENERAL KAULBARS, to Bulgaria, bearing an ultimatum, which demanded the raising of the state of siege in Bulgaria, the liberation of the political prisoners, and the indefinite postponement of the elections for members of the Great Sobranye to choose a new Prince. The Bulgarian Government replied that they would comply to the extent that the Constitution and laws permitted. General Kaulbars was driven from the platform at a public meeting in Sofia when he attempted to address the people. He started early in October on a tour of the country, and it is alleged endeavored to win the army over to the Czar. At this date [Oct. 7] the whole question is in a most critical condition. Austria has declared that she will not allow any single Power to make armed interference in Bulgaria; England is with Austria; Germany is coquetting with both Russia and Austria, and Turkey is apparently waiting for bids.

FRANCE.—The most important political movement in France during the past six months was the BANISHMENT OF THE PRINCES. The laws of proscription against the elder Bourbons and the Orleans family had been abolished by the Republic in 1872. Since then, with only occasional mutterings against them, the French princes had lived in peace and honor in their native land. The occasion of the renewal of proscription was almost trivial. A matrimonial alliance between the royal family of Portugal and the family of the Comte de Paris was contracted in May. An unusually brilliant reception was given by the count in Paris on May 15, just before his departure to attend the wedding at Lisbon. While inviting the heads of legations to attend, the count, with his usual tact, informed them that their presence might attract comments which he would be glad to avoid. A very distinguished company was, however, present, and an unusually warm royalist article in *Figaro* on the next day served to exaggerate the importance of the event. M. de Freycinet's Cabinet were not, however, alarmed by it. But the Radical leader, M. Clemenceau, seized the political opportunity to worry the time-serving Prime Minister, and raised the cry for the expulsion of the princes. The Chambers were soon to meet and the Prime Minister feared their interrogatories. He endeavored, unsuccessfully, to shift the responsibility of expulsion upon President Grévy, but the latter adroitly demanded the authority of a special law. The Cabinet, therefore, began consideration of the question, and on May 25, by the close vote of 6 to 5, adopted the principle of the expulsion of the princes. Two days later the Government proposed a bill in the Chamber of Deputies, authorizing it to banish the members of families that had once reigned in France. This left expulsion optional, and did not satisfy the Radicals. The bill was referred to a committee, which reported in favor of the immediate expulsion of all the princes. The Chamber of Deputies, on June 11, rejected this sweeping expulsion by a vote of 314 to 220, and adopted an amendment making the expulsion of the Comte de Paris and Prince Napoleon and their eldest sons obligatory. The Government was also empowered to expel by decree the rest of the princes, and to provide penalties of two to five years' imprisonment if they should return to France. On June 22 this bill was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 141 to 107, and on the afternoon of the following day the Government issued the decree of banishment. Immediately Prince Jerome Napoleon (Plon Plon) went to Geneva, and Prince Victor, his son, to Brussels. The Comte de Paris, his son, Duc

d'Orleans, and suite, went to Tunbridge Wells, England, to reside. On leaving France the count issued a MANIFESTO, in which he said: "I am constrained to leave my country. I protest, in the name of justice, against the violence done me. I am passionately attached to my country, whose misfortunes have rendered her still dearer to me. I lived there without infringing the laws. . . . In me is persecuted the monarchical principle transmitted as a trust by him who had so nobly preserved it. . . . The republic is afraid. In striking me it marks me out. I have confidence in France, and at the decisive hour I shall be ready." This manifesto caused considerable excitement in France, and seemed to be an unlooked-for justification of his expulsion as an enemy of the republic. THE OTHER PRINCES were to be allowed to live in retirement in France. According to the law of expulsion none of the members of their families were to be allowed to enter the army. As soon as it was promulgated General Boulanger, Minister of War, informed all the officers belonging to the Orleans and Bonaparte families that they had been struck off the army list. The DUC D'AUMALE and Prince Murat came under this order. It is held that the Minister of War had no right to strike these officers from the army list, though he could deprive them of their employ. In his own defence General Boulanger contended that the Duc d'Aumale and Prince Murat had not obtained their grades regularly and in conformity with the law. The former, holding the rank of General of Division, made on July 12 a stirring appeal to the Council of State against his expulsion from the army. A decree was straightway issued expelling him from France, and the Duc de Chartres was warned not to follow his example, under penalty of the confiscation of all property in France belonging to the Orleans family. Amid great uproar, in the Senate, on July 15, Baron Lareinty declared that the expulsion of the Duc d'Aumale was an act of cowardice. GENERAL BOULANGER, Minister of War, declared that he would not permit such an expression to be applied to him in his official capacity. He challenged the baron and a bloodless duel was fought. This incident, together with the organization by Boulanger of an army and navy club, and other moves for popularity, caused the cry to be raised that he was ambitious to become a new Dictator. He was accused of plotting to rise to power through war. Old letters of his were published, which he had written as an inferior officer, declaring his fealty to the Duc d'Aumale, then his general. These, Boulanger declared, were only natural expressions of regard for a superior officer, and were not political. With the usual French impulsiveness General Boulanger was by turns the hero of the hour or the butt of all ridicule. Out of all this hubbub he seems to have come with the balance of victory in his favor. He is now a notable but scarcely a dangerous figure in French political life.—The Duc d'Aumale has announced that he has presented to the Institute of France, for the benefit of the French nation, the entire domain of Chantilly, valued at the lowest estimate at $12,000,000.—THE NEW HEBRIDES AFFAIR. It was rumored in June that France had annexed the New Hebrides. The British Government immediately made inquiries from France and were assured that the flag had not been hoisted officially over the islands, but was simply displayed over a French storehouse on one of them. France and England have somewhat modified their convention relating to the New Hebrides. The trouble still continues, and France is said to exercise practical sovereignty over the islands. MADAGASCAR.—Just before adjourning the session on July 16 the Chamber of Deputies adopted a credit of 5,000,000 francs for expenses in Madagascar. In September, the condition of affairs there not being satisfactory, it was resolved to send reinforcements to Tamatave. The trouble is, however, being adjusted by diplomacy.

THE PANAMA CANAL.—The delegate, M. Rousseau, appointed by the French Government to inspect the work on the Panama canal, presented a report in May denying the correctness of the Canal Company's statements, disputing its facilities for construction, the time when the canal will be completed, and the amount of money still required. The French Government immediately informed M. de Lesseps that they could not authorize the proposed issue of lottery bonds until the position of the company was made clear. M. de Lesseps made light of this, and requested the Prime Minister to withdraw the Lottery Bill, but reserved the right to appeal to the public to subscribe to a fresh issue of Panama Canal shares. Accordingly, in August, he issued bonds of 1,000 francs at 450, paying interest at 30 francs yearly, reimbursements at par to begin immediately by drawings every two months. In this way he hopes to raise enough to push forward the work on the canal so as to make success apparent. Then he will induce the Government to authorize a lottery. The number who applied for these new bonds exceeded the most sanguine hopes of the company.

GERMANY.—SOCIALISM.—On the last day of March the Reichstag by a vote of 173 to 146 prolonged the Anti-Socialist Law two years. The minority were German Liberals, the Socialists abstaining from voting.—SPIRITS MONOPOLY.—The Spirits Monopoly Bill was referred by the Reichstag on May 24 to a committee. The Reichstag then adjourned *sine die*.—It is estimated that the IMPERIAL REVENUE for the current fiscal year will fall 17,000,000 marks below the estimate. The deficiency is attributed to a

decrease in the revenue derived from the sugar tax.—PRUSSIA AND THE VATICAN in August signed a convention terminating the religious controversy between them so far as it related to all secondary matters, and regulating the presentation of benefices and appointments to ecclesiastical seminaries within the Kingdom of Prussia.—SAMOA. In May a German man-of-war proceeded to the territory of King Tomasese, whom Germany upholds against King Malietoa. Against this the British and American consuls at Apia drew up a formal protest, the latter even going so far as to establish a protectorate over the disputed territory. He has been removed by President Cleveland. The result of the whole complication was that Germany disclaimed any right to establish a protectorate without the consent of Great Britain and America. At Germany's proposal the three Powers have despatched special commissioners to Samoa, and they are amicably adjusting the difficulty.—POLISH EXPROPRIATION. In April the Prussian Diet adopted the bill expropriating the land of the Poles in Posen, and colonizing the province with Germans. One hundred million marks were placed at the disposal of the Government for this purpose.

BAVARIA.—King Ludwig II. was early in June pronounced insane by a medical commission, and Prince Luitpold, his uncle, assumed the Regency. The dethroned king, while walking along the shores of Lake Starnberg with his physician, Dr. Gudden, on June 13, jumped into the water, and, after a struggle with Dr. Gudden, who tried to save him, both were drowned. The king was forty-one years of age, a lavish patron of music and art, the friend of Wagner, and in all things a most eccentric character. He was greatly beloved by his people. The king's brother was made nominal king under the title of Otto I., but being mentally incapacitated, Prince Luitpold remains Regent.

BELGIUM.—To allay the labor trouble a loan of $8,600,000 was issued by the Government for unemployed artisans and laborers.

HOLLAND.—Elections in Holland in June showed Liberal gains in the Chamber. —There were SERIOUS RIOTS at Amsterdam on July 25 and 26, because of the prohibition of certain popular and brutal games on Sunday. Socialists fomented the disorder. A number of the rioters were killed and wounded.

AUSTRIA.—The resignation of General Edelsheim-Gynlai and the promotion of General Jansky was taken by the Hungarian people as an insult to the memory of one of their heroes. The Emperor Francis Joseph wrote a personal letter to the Hungarian Prime Minister which was very conciliatory in tone, and pacified the Hungarians.

SPAIN.—The Spanish elections resulted in large ministerialist majorities in both branches of the Cortes, which assembled on May 10. Prime Minister Sagasta read the speech from the throne, which stated that the Government was studying the socialist question, but did not outline any measure in regard to it. The financial policy of the Government had been arranged to avoid an increase of taxation. A measure, it stated, would be submitted, prolonging all treaties of commerce. The negotiations for a treaty with America were said to still continue.—Queen Christina, on May 17, gave birth to a son and HEIR TO THE SPANISH THRONE. There was great rejoicing over the event. The new king has been named Fernando Ildefonso. It is feared that his mother is suffering from the same pulmonary disease which caused her husband's death.—The Cortes, in June, by a majority of 200 votes, declared that no Government of Spain will ever give autonomy to CUBA. A resolution to free as soon as possible the remaining 26,000 slaves in Cuba was passed in July.—A REVOLUTION was attempted in Madrid on September 19, by 300 members of a Spanish infantry regiment. A panic was created in the streets, but the rest of the troops remained loyal and drove the revolutionists from the city; most of them were hunted down and arrested. The rebel leader was Brigadier-General Vallacampa, who was arrested. Six of the officers implicated were condemned to death, but their sentence was commuted to imprisonment for life. This led, on Oct. 6, to the resignation of the Ministers, and the formation of a new Cabinet by Premier Sagasta. It is believed that Zorilla engineered the revolt from Paris for stock-jobbing purposes.

ITALY.—THE VATICAN. There was a rumor in August that Queen Margarita of Italy was using her influence to bring about a reconciliation between the Italian Government and the Vatican, involving the payment by Italy of large arrears of endowment to be devoted to extending Catholic missions. —A decree was published by the Pope, dated July 13, reinstating the Jesuit order in all the privileges which it ever enjoyed, notwithstanding the decree of Pope Clement XIV., pronounced against it in 1773. The Pope's course in favoring the Jesuits has caused general dismay in Italy, and the Government are asked to enforce inexorably the laws against them.

RUSSIA.—NIHILISM. The chief authorities of all the universities in the empire were ordered in April to adopt means for the immediate and permanent suppression of all forms of political agitation by young students —THE PORT OF BATUM. A Russian imperial ukase was issued, declaring that the Port of Batum would not be free after July 29. In explaining why this was not a violation of the Berlin Treaty, Russia said that Batum was made a free port under

the influence of circumstances which have entirely changed. The present condition of the affairs of the port was onerous for the Treasury. The Customs cordon on the land side was prejudicial to the material and commercial development of Batum, and to the district incorporated with Russia after the Russo-Turkish war; and the naphtha trade had been seriously affected. The people also complained of the octroi duties. In view of all these circumstances Russia considered that Article 59 of the Berlin Treaty was exceptional, as it was merely a spontaneous declaration that Russia was willing to make Batum a free port.

CHINA.—It was reported that French engineers were to construct a great system of CHINESE RAILWAYS.—There were rumors of war preparations by China against Russia in August. But early in September the Marquis Tseng declared that the RUSSO-CHINESE DIFFICULTY was ended.—Wholesale massacres of Christians were reported in September, from the provinces of Sechuen and Cochin China.

SOUTH AMERICA.—Maximo Santos was in May appointed PRESIDENT OF URUGUAY, President Vidal having resigned. General Caceras took his seat as PRESIDENT OF PERU on June 3. Juarez Selman was in June elected President of the Argentine Republic. A revolution was threatened in Uruguay on August 17, and an unsuccessful attempt was made to assassinate the President.

CENTRAL AMERICA.—The Presidents and ex-Presidents of the Republics of Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Guatemala met in August and discussed a plan for the union of those States in one Confederation. Nothing definite has yet resulted from it.

MEXICO. — Revolutionary movements have been frequent in the border States of Mexico. In July the State of Tamaulipas was thrown into confusion by Juan Trevino and a band of rebels who captured the town of Agualeguas. The Civil Governor was deposed and a Military Governor appointed in his place. In September a revolutionary leader, known as El Coyote, with a number of bandits, and also the band of Mauricio Cruz, were completely defeated, and El Coyote killed.

AFRICA.—M. de Brazza was in April gazetted as Governor of the Congo and Gaboon colonies.

SCIENCE.

ASTRONOMY.—The MM. Henry contribute to *La Nature* a description of the photographic telescope which they used in their recent researches. The photographic object-glass has an aperture of 0.34 metres, and a focal length of 3.43 metres. Parallel to this is mounted a smaller telescope, for eye observations, which serves as a finder and pointer. The time of exposure varies with the magnitude of the stars observed from 0.005 sec. for stars of the first magnitude, to 1 hour 23 min. for those of the fifteenth.

Professor Pritchard, of the Observatory at Oxford, presented to the Royal Society, on May 27, the results of his researches in STELLAR PHOTOGRAPHY. He investigated the question whether a relation could be found between the diameters of the images of the star-disks obtained on the photographic plates and the magnitude of the star measured photometrically. The relation was found to be expressed by a simple formula. He satisfied himself, also, by comparison of the measurements of the distances between the images of twenty-five of the Pleiades with those same distances as given by Bessel, from measurements with the heliometer, that the pictures really represent the relative distances of the stars, and that these distances can be accurately measured.

Doctor B. A. Gould read a paper at the meeting of the American Association at Buffalo, giving an account of the work done by him in stellar photography at Cordova. He has obtained in all about 1,300 photographs of Southern clusters and double stars, and of the Pleiades. Four stars, selected on account of their large proper motion as likely to show a parallax, have also been repeatedly observed. The measurements and computations have been begun.

A short paper by M. Belopolsky, of the Moscow Observatory, in the *Astronomische Nachrichten*, No. 2,722, contains a theory of the constitution of the sun, which offers an explanation of the phenomena connected with the movement of sun spots on the solar surface. It is based upon an investigation by Doctor Jukowsky of the condition of a rotating liquid globe, in which the angular velocity varies from centre to surface. In case it increases, surface currents set from the pole to the equator; in case it decreases, the currents are from the equator to the pole. M. Belopolsky verified these conclusions by the use of glass globes filled with water, in which were immersed some small bodies having the same specific gravity as the water. Two movements of the sun spots have been recognized, a general tendency toward the poles, and a narrowing of the zone of sun-spot disturbance during the progress of each epoch. This latter movement is ascribed to currents at a considerable depth, and the first to currents on the surface. These indicate, therefore, a rotation of the sun increasing in angular velocity from surface to centre.

From hypotheses as to the rate of variation of gravity and of angular velocity beneath the sun's surface, M. Belopolsky arrives at a formula for the surface rotation identical with that given by Spörer from observation.

The total SOLAR ECLIPSE OF 1886 was observed successfully by the English party at Grenada on the morning of August 29. The party of eight was distributed at several stations, at all but one of which observations were made, though clouds interfered with several of them during a portion of the totality. Professor Tacchini made what was perhaps the most valuable observation. He noted the prominences visible during the eclipse, observing that they had the same characteristics as the "white" prominences observed by him in 1883. He also observed the prominences by the ordinary spectroscopic method as soon as possible after the end of the eclipse, and found that they were not the same as those before seen. Those which were visible by both methods were different in appearance, the spectroscope showing only the central portions, to which the part visible during totality formed a whitish border. Professor Tacchini is convinced also that the sudden "flash" of bright lines in the spectrum just at totality, hitherto attributed to a thin stratum of incandescent vapors, comes from the higher regions of the solar atmosphere, the spectrum of which becomes visible the moment the reflected light in the earth's atmosphere is reduced by the passage of the lower portions of the corona behind the moon's disk.

Mr. Lockyer's hypothesis that the ordinary elements are dissociated by the sun's heat, and their constituents occupy different strata of the sun's atmosphere, was tested by observing the relative brightness of certain lines known to increase in brightness at high temperatures. The result of the test is in favor of the hypothesis.

To test the success of Doctor Huggins' attempt to photograph the corona in full sunlight, an attempt was made to photograph the image of the moon during partial eclipse, projected on the corona, and also to obtain photographs of the corona by Doctor Huggins' method during totality, and before totality. In the photographs obtained the moon does not appear projected on the corona, no corona appears at all on the plates exposed by Doctor Huggins' method during totality, and the appearances on the other plates seem to be due to glare, and do not represent the corona as observed. This negative result is very disappointing. There is only slight hope that atmospheric causes may have interfered with success. Twenty photographs of the corona and seven of its spectrum were obtained by the ordinary method. Observations of the corona by the eye, which had been carefully shielded from light for some time before the eclipse, and which was protected from the light of the lower and brighter portions of the corona, show no such equatorial extension of the corona as has before been observed. This observation, however, is not conclusive, on account of the misty state of the atmosphere.

On May 6 J. Norman Lockyer presented to the Royal Society an important paper discussing the observations on SUN-SPOT SPECTRA which have been made at Kensington. He finds at a period of sun-spot minimum a large number of lines of well-known metals, such as iron and nickel, to be widened in the sun-spot spectra. At a period of sun-spot maximum these lines are absent, and widened lines appear, which have never been recognized as belonging to any known element. Mr. Lockyer considers the unknown lines as belonging to some more fundamental or "basic" element into which our so-called elements break up. He attributes the formation of spots to the falling in upon the sun of solid masses collected in the outer regions of the sun's atmosphere. At the time of sun-spot maximum these masses reach the photosphere, and the violent explosions which follow give rise to the metallic prominences. The heated masses thus driven out extend the hot regions of the sun's atmosphere, and thus diminish the number of spots formed, because dissociation of the down-falling masses then occurs before the photosphere is reached.

The announcement has been made to the French Academy that M. Perrotin and other observers at Nice have been able to detect on the surface of Mars the so-called "canals" drawn by Schiaparelli in 1881–82. It appears probable that the "canals" vary in distinctness with the changes of the martial seasons.

At the Vienna Observatory, Palisa discovered, on March 31, minor planets Nos. 254 and 255, on April 3, No. 256, and on April 5, No. 257.

At the Red House Observatory, Phelps, N. Y., Mr. Brooks discovered three comets, on April 27, April 30, and May 23.

At Düsseldorf Doctor Luther discovered, on May 4, minor planet No. 258.

At Clinton, N. Y., Professor Peters discovered, on June 28, minor planet No. 259.

A new comet was discovered on September 26, by Professor Finley, at the Cape of Good Hope.

The new Observatory at Bamberg is to be furnished with a seven-inch heliometer, the largest of its kind in the world. A systematic investigation of the parallaxes of the fixed stars will be undertaken.

The trustees of the Lick Observatory have given the contract for mounting the thirty-six-inch refractor to Warner & Swasey, of Cleveland, Ohio. The glass is nearly complete. It has been mounted and tested, and is pronounced to be excellent by those astronomers who have had an opportunity to examine its performances. The plate of crown glass which was bought from Feil & Mantois for the construction of an extra lens for photographic purposes showed evidence of internal strain before work was begun upon it. This fact was reported to Messrs. Feil & Mantois, and they assumed the risk

of breakage during the grinding. Work was begun and carried on for some time successfully, but before the glass was ready for testing it broke into three pieces on the grinding tool. The mounting of the telescope will accordingly be delayed until a new glass can be cast and figured.

PHYSICS.—Professor Oliver Lodge published a letter in *Nature* of March 25, 1886, giving an account of a series of experiments in which he has apparently found in many substances a PERMANENT MAGNETIC POLARITY, of the same sort as that described by Doctor Tumlirz in quartz, and noticed in the last Scientific Record of this Review. The bodies tested—woods, metals, glass, coke, wax, chalk, ebonite, etc.—were suspended between the poles of an electro-magnet. The magnet was then actuated by a strong current, the current stopped, and a weak one sent through in the reverse direction. The suspended bodies then turned through 180°, behaving exactly as if they were weak permanent magnets. Professor Lodge is inclined to believe that his results point to a magnetic retentivity in all matter, though he points out how a trace of iron existing in the body tested might give rise to the phenomena observed.

Mr. Herbert Tomlinson has sent to the Royal Society three communications read March 11, May 6, and May 27, containing a continuation of his work on the INFLUENCE OF STRESS AND STRAIN on the other physical properties of matter. The facts which he has collected from a long and laborious series of experiments form a most valuable addition to our knowledge of Molecular Physics. The present papers deal with the Internal Friction of Metals. Mr. Tomlinson accepts the view of G. Wiedemann that the loss of energy due to internal friction in a torsionally vibrating wire is mainly due to a to-and-fro rotation of the molecules about their axes. His results show relations between the amount of internal friction and the longitudinal extension or torsion of the metal wires tested, and demonstrate also effects due to mechanical shock, fluctuations of temperature, and magnetization.

M. Cornu has published in the *Journal de Physique* a short paper on the Hydrogenic Function of Certain Metals. He finds that certain lines in the ultra violet spectra of aluminium and thallium, which are spontaneously reversed in the electric arc, coincide both in distribution and intensity with the lines due to hydrogen in the same part of the spectrum. He compares, in like manner, the more complex groups, like magnesium, zinc, and sodium. While unwilling to state his results as yet in the form of a general law, he believes that there is ground for considering that the succession of spectral lines can be stated by the help of a single function, which he calls the "hydrogenic function."

M. Janssen has discovered an ABSORPTION SPECTRUM OF OXYGEN which is different from that known to give the A and B groups in the solar spectrum. The new spectrum is seen when the gas is under pressure, and becomes very apparent when the pressure is increased considerably above that of the atmosphere. It consists of a system of shaded bands which can only with difficulty be resolved. It is shown by M. Janssen that these bands are developed not in proportion to the density of the gas, but to the square of the density.

In the *American Journal of Science and Arts* for May, 1886, A. A. Michelson and E. W. Morley describe their repetition of an experiment of Fizeau, to test the influence of the motion of the medium on the VELOCITY OF LIGHT. The conclusion drawn from the observations is that Fizeau's results are substantially correct, and that the luminiferous ether is entirely unaffected by the motion of the matter which it permeates.

Clausius considers, in the *Bulletin de l'Academie Royale de Belgique* of March 6, the experiments of M. Hirn on the EFFLUX OF GASES under pressure, noticed in the last Scientific Record of this Review, and argues that they do not present any facts which are in opposition to the kinetic theory of gases.

Captain Defforges, of the French Geographical Service, has lately made a new determination of the length of the SECONDS PENDULUM at Paris. The value obtained by him of this constant is 0.99394 metres.

MATHEMATICS.—Professor Sylvester, of Oxford University, publishes in *Nature*, of August 19, a short note containing a statement of the GENERAL DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION for a curve of any order. This is the generalization of a problem which has long occupied the attention of mathematicians. Hitherto the differential equations for the conic and cubic are the only ones which had been obtained.

The lectures of Professor Sylvester on his new Theory of Reciprocants, noticed in the last Scientific Record, have been reported stenographically, and are appearing in the *American Journal of Mathematics*. They are carefully edited by Mr. J. Hammond.

CHEMISTRY.—Prof. Clemens Winkler, of the Royal Mining Academy at Freiberg, communicated to the *Journal für praktische Chemie*, Vol. 34, 1886, his observations on the peculiarities of the NEW ELEMENT, GERMANIUM, discovered by him, and noticed in the last Scientific Record. The isolation and investigation of the element was difficult on account of the unusual solubility of its compounds, and of the presence of arsenic and antimony in the minerals accompanying the mineral argyrodite, in which germanium was found. Germanium is very similar in some of its properties to antimony, and Professor Winkler was at first misled in his

investigations by the hypothesis that it was the element ekantimony predicted by Mendelejeff, in the antimony and bismuth group. It is now definitely settled that germanium fills a gap in the group containing carbon, silicium, titanium, zirconium, and tin. This gap was noticed by Newlands in 1864, and the hypothetical element needed to fill it was named by Mendelejeff ekasilicium.

The mineral argyrodite, in which the new element was discovered, was found in September, 1885, in one of the Freiberg mines. It was recognized as new, and named by A. Weisbach, and studied by him and Richter. Its principal constituent is silver, of which there is nearly 75 per cent. in combination with sulphur. There are also traces of iron, zinc, and mercury. When Winkler attempted to make a complete analysis he met very discordant results, which could not be accounted for except by the hypothesis of the presence of an unknown element. After a tedious investigation this element has been isolated and studied.

The isolated element crystallizes readily in beautiful octahedra, very brittle, gray-white in color, and with a pronounced metallic lustre. Its specific gravity is 5.469 at 20.4° C. When melted at the blow-pipe and dropped on paper, it breaks up like antimony into a shower of little globules. The determination of the atomic weight was of course of prime importance in assigning the position of the new element in the scheme of the natural classification. The gravimetric methods first tried by Winkler gave discordant results, on account of the incompleteness of the methods of reduction employed in the determination. He resorted therefore to a volumetric method, and determined by trituration the quantity of chlorine present in a known quantity of chloride of germanium. The mean of four very concordant measurements gives as the atomic weight of germanium the number 72.32. Specimens of the element were sent to Lecoq de Boisbaudran, who investigated its spark spectrum. From the wave-lengths of two prominent lines in the blue and the violet, he estimated an atomic weight of 72.28. Nilson and Petterson, at Stockholm, have determined the specific heat to be about 5.50, and Kopp has recognized in the spectrum one line in the orange, one in the yellow, four in the violet, and twelve in the blue and green. The melting-point lies at about 900° C., a little below that of silver.

The compounds of germanium which are as yet surely known, are two oxides, Ge O and Ge O_2; two sulphides, Ge S and Ge S_2; two chlorides, Ge Cl_2 and Ge Cl_4; and one iodide, Ge I_4. Germanium is quadrivalent, like the other elements of its group.

Professor Winkler compares the properties of germanium with those predicted by Mendelejeff, by the help of his periodic law, for ekasilicium. Mendelejeff assigned to the unknown element a specific gravity 5.5, an atomic weight 72, a dark gray color. He also said that it would be melted with difficulty. Its principal oxide was to be a powder difficult to fuse, with a specific gravity 4.7, and an atomic volume 22; its principal chloride, a volatile liquid boiling below 100°, with a specific gravity 1.9, and an atomic volume 113. The oxide of germanium is in fact a white dense powder, so refractory as to bear a bright red heat without melting or losing weight. Its specific gravity at 18.0° C. is 4.703, and its atomic volume 22.0. The chloride of germanium is a colorless liquid, with a specific gravity 1.887 at 18.0° C., and atomic volume 113.3. Its boiling-point is 86° C., but it vaporizes very readily at ordinary temperatures. Some of the other properties predicted for ekasilicium do not agree so well with the facts as discovered in germanium, and many have not yet been investigated. Enough has been done to show the complete identity of the two.

A controversy has arisen over the name germanium. M. Quesneville, editor of the *Moniteur Scientifique*, has published a note calling on Professor Winkler to abandon the name germanium, *qui a un goût de terroir trop prononcé*, and adopt ekasilicium. Professor Winkler replies briefly by quoting the element gallium, Mendelejeff's ekaluminium, discovered and named by Lecoq de Boisbaudran, and scandium, Mendelejeff's ekaboron, discovered and named by Nilson.

At the meeting of the British Association for the advancement of science, Mr. Crookes, the president of the chemical section, delivered the opening address on what may be called CHEMICAL EVOLUTION. He pointed out the relations stated in the well-known periodic law, and discussed the possibility of there being atoms of the bodies which are now considered elements, having slightly different atomic weights and rates of vibration. He then developed a scheme illustrating how our so-called elements may have been evolved from some one original element, by a fall in temperature.

Mr. Crookes and M. Lecoq de Boisbaudran, during their investigations of the absorption spectra, and the phosphorescent spectra given in vacuo by certain rare earths, have detected lines and bands which they ascribe to new elements. These elements have not been isolated.

Among the papers of the late Professor Linnemann of Prague, was found the announcement of his discovery by the spectroscope of a new element, named by him Austrium.

THE NATURAL SCIENCES.—W. Baldwin Spencer, of the University Museum of Oxford, writes to *Nature* of May 13, 1886, giving a brief account of a curious sense-organ discovered by him in several lizards. This organ is embedded in the substance occu-

pying the parietal foramen, and is a structure resembling a highly organized invertebrate eye, provided with a well-marked nerve. The nerve is single, medianly placed, and communicates directly with the brain. This eye is completely covered with connective tissue, and seems to be of no use to the animal.

Mr. Geo. T. Kemp, in Vol. III., No. 6, of *Studies from the Biological Laboratory*, Johns Hopkins University, concludes that the blood contains, besides the red and white corpuscles, a third element, which he calls the BLOOD PLAQUES. He shows that there is no evidence of connection between the plaques and the other elements of the blood, and they are to be regarded as independent. When the blood is drawn, the plaques break down almost at once. They appear to give up a soluble substance which is active in the coagulation of the blood.

W. Bateson claims to have discovered in the worm-like balanoglossus a dorsal chord like the notochord of lancelet and of the embryo-vertebrates. Balanoglossus has long been noteworthy for the possession of gill-clefts foreshadowing those of fishes. This new discovery, if authenticated, will make good its claim to go along with the Ascidian as one of the "missing links."

George J. Romanes furnishes, in *Nature* of August 5, ff., a supplement to the Darwinian doctrine of natural selection, and calls his new theory PHYSIOLOGICAL SELECTION. It has long been known that the variations laid hold of by natural selection became permanent only when intercrossing with the original stock is prevented; and the migration of varieties to islands or to isolated continental regions, by preventing such intercrossing, has been favorable to the fixation of new characters and to the development of species. Romanes finds that sterility often arises between varieties and the parent stock, from some functional changes in the reproductive system, and this causes a physiological barrier, which favors the origin of species in the way suggested by Darwin, formed and supplemented by this physiological selection.

Wm. Carruthers, the President of the Linnæan Society, discussed the FIXITY OF SPECIES in his inaugural address to the Biological Section at the late meeting of the British Association. The comparison of living species of plants with those existing in the oldest herbaria, shows that at least during the last three centuries no changes of specific character have occurred; and specimens of wood remaining since the times of the Roman occupation of Britain do not in any respect differ from the wood of trees now living. Of the plants found in Egyptian mummies, fifty-nine species have been identified, and many of these have the delicate details preserved, even to the coloring of petals; yet they differ in no respect from modern representatives of the several species; the only seemingly exceptional case being the vine, which has white hairs on the under surface of the leaves. We find that when the mummies were embalmed the weeds in Egyptian fields were precisely the same as abound at the present time. The cereals from the Egyptian tombs, and the maize from the mounds of the Mississippi and from Peru, show that the various kinds of grain have not been improved by modern cultivation. The same law of fixity is also brought out by a comparison of modern forms with plant remains in ancient peat-bogs, and in post-glacial and pre-glacial formations, the latter estimated to be 250,000 years old. Without discussing the bearing of these facts on biological theories, the author held that it confirms the long-established axiom that by working naturalists species must be dealt with as fixed quantities.

MISCELLANEOUS.—M. Vulpian was elected permanent Secretary of the French Academy of Sciences, to fill the place left vacant by the death of M. Jamin.

The Congress of French Scientific Societies held its first general meeting in Paris on April 27. M. Bertrand, director of the Archæological Museum of St. Germain, presided. M. Faye was president of the section of sciences.

The English Institution of Mechanical Engineers held its annual meeting on May 6 and 7. Its summer meeting was begun on August 17.

The English Iron and Steel Institute held its annual meeting on May 12, 13, and 14.

The French Association for the Advancement of Science met at Nancy on August 12. M. Friedel presided, and gave an address on the progress of chemistry and mineralogy.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science met at Buffalo, New York, on August 18. Prof. E. S. Morse, of Salem, Mass., presided. The address by the retiring president, Prof. H. A. Newton, of New Haven, treated of meteors, meteorites, and shooting stars.

The Swiss Society of Natural Sciences met at Geneva on August 10. Prof. Louis Soret presided.

The British Association for the Advancement of Science met at Birmingham on September 1. Sir William Dawson, of Montreal, the president of the meeting, delivered the inaugural address on questions respecting the Atlantic Ocean.

The Association of German Naturalists and Physicians held its annual meeting at Berlin from September 18 to 24.

On August 31, 1886, M. Chevreul, the distinguished chemist, celebrated his one hundredth birthday. M. Chevreul was born in Angers, went to Paris in 1803, and studied chemistry under Vauquelin. At the age of

thirty he was appointed special professor of chemistry in charge of the dyeing department at the Gobelins. His principal work was his investigation of the fats. He was made a member of the Academy of Sciences in 1826. On his birthday he received the congratulations of various societies, his statue was unveiled in the hall of the new museum at the Jardin des Plantes, and there was a procession in his honor.

The American Academy, at its meeting on May 25, voted to present both the Rumford medals to Professor S. P. Langley of Allegheny, for his work on Radiant Energy.

NECROLOGY.—T. Spencer Cobbold died in March, aged fifty-seven. He was Professor of Geology for the British Museum, and author of a treatise on the Entozoa, and of important articles on morphological subjects.

Professor Melsens, of Brussels, a distinguished chemist, died in April.

E. Linnemann, Professor of Chemistry at Prague, died on April 27.

Timothy Lewis died on May 7. He was Assistant Professor of Pathology in the Netley Army Medical College, England. He was well known for his studies of the cholera, and was one of the first opponents of Koch's claim to have discovered the cause of the disease in the comma bacillus.

Hermann Abich died at Vienna on July 1. He was a distinguished naturalist and geologist.

Mr. George Busk died in August. He was eminent for his researches in biology, especially among the Polyzoa. He prepared the report on the Polyzoa collected during the voyage of the *Challenger*.

M. Laguerre, the mathematician, member of the French Academy, died on August 13.

Alessandro Dorna, director of the Astronomical Observatory at Turin, died on August 19.

LITERATURE.

GREEK PLAYS.—The students of the University of Pennsylvania, under the direction of Professor Easton, gave a successful presentation of Aristophanes' comedy *The Acharnians*, in the Academy of Music, May 14 and May 15. The music of the choruses was composed by Prof. Hugh Clarke. The costumes, *chitons*, *beinatia*, and the leather and bronze armor, were carefully made from ancient models. The outlay amounted to $4,000. This, and the Harvard *Œdipus* in 1881, are the only presentations of a Greek play attempted in America. *The Acharnians* is to be given again in New York, in November.

In London, last May, Professor Warr gave in Prince's Hall a series of scenes and tableaux from Homer, representing "The Tale of Troy," and a series giving "The Story of Orestes," from Æschylus' *Oresteia*. About the same time, Mr. Godwin made a close reconstruction of a Greek theatre, in which Mr. John Todhunter's classical play, *Helena in Troas*, was effectively performed, Miss Alma Murray acting Helen. The proceeds in the latter case were devoted to the incipient British School of Archæology at Athens.

The "gymnasiasts" who performed the *Antigone* of Sophocles at the recent opening of the new school buildings in Amsterdam have been invited by the King of Greece to repeat it before him in Athens, the king assuming the entire expense.

LITERARY SOCIETIES. — The English Wordsworth Society held its final meeting on July 7. Lord Selborne delivered an address on Wordsworth, and Professor Knight gave a review of what the Society had done. A final volume of the Society's *Transactions* will include some further unpublished letters of the poet and his sister. Also a volume of selections is to be issued, contributed by fifteen members, among them Mr. Lowell, Mr. Matthew Arnold, and Mr. Stopford Brooke. It is proposed to establish a hall somewhere in the Lake country, to preserve memorials of Wordsworth and of the Lake poets.

The Browning Society has 238 members, more than one-third being Americans, who thus have the benefit of the Society's publications. Mr. Browning has sanctioned the republication of his rarest work, *Pauline* (1883), for distribution to the members.

The German Goethe Society celebrated its first anniversary, May 2, at Weimar. A large assemblage was gathered. Dr. Herman Grimm, of Berlin, made the chief address, on "Goethe in Relation to our own Times." Professor Schmidt, of Weimar, reported on the rich treasures contained in the archives recently made accessible. A Goethe exhibition of objects of interest was arranged, and in the evening *Palæphoon and Neoterpe* was acted at the theatre, with costumes, scenery, and decorations the same as those used at its first presentation, October 24, 1800. The Society has 1833 members. A "monumental edition" of the complete works of Goethe is in progress, under the special patronage of the Grand-Duchess Sophia, to include his diary and letters, and a biography in three volumes. The formal inauguration of the Goethe National Museum at Weimar took place July 3. The building is the Goethe residence, and contains all the pictures, works of art, and the like which surrounded the poet in life. The two rooms in which he worked and died have been sacredly kept in the exact condition in which Goethe used and left them.

The English Goethe Society held its inaugural meeting May 28. Prof. Max Müller, as president, delivered the opening address, which was on "World Literature, illustrated by Newly Discovered Letters from

Goethe to Carlyle," since printed in the *Contemporary* for July. Professor Blackie made a characteristic speech, in which he described Carlyle as "the Titan of depreciators," Goethe "the Jove of appreciators." Professor Dowden sent a letter, in which he contrasted Goethe's spirit and work with that of Voltaire and Rousseau. The Society, numbering some 150, resolved to affiliate itself with the Weimar Society in order to secure the latter's publications, such as the handsome *Goethe Jahrbuch*, 1886, already distributed. The ordinary meetings —the first was held June 2—are set for the first Monday in June, October, November, and December. Branch societies have been formed at Oxford and Cambridge. The Oxford Society will give its attention chiefly to Goethe's influence on archæology and art, as illustrated in the *Italienische Reise* and elsewhere.

The Shelley Society has shown great activity and enthusiasm. It has nearly 400 members. Seven volumes out of thirteen proposed for the first year have been issued, chiefly "facsimile" reprints of first editions, essays, biographical, bibliographical, etc. Interest culminated in the performance, May 7, for the first time of Shelley's *Cenci*. The performance was successful; though to few but ardent Shelleyites does this theme, however idealized, seem a fit one for the stage. Mr. Todhunter wrote an effective prelude. The acting of Miss Alma Murray as *Beatrice* elicited the warmest commendations; Lady Shelley divided with her for a memento a precious lock of the poet's hair, and Robert Browning wrote her a personal letter. The *Hellas* is likewise to be produced shortly. A minute concordance to Shelley's works is under way.

BOOKS.—Deserving special note among recent American books is the *Othello* in Mr. H. H. Furness's Variorum Shakespeare; characterized, like its predecessors, by exhaustive treatment and scrupulous accuracy. In this volume Mr. Furness abandons his plan of reëditing the text, and reprints that of the First Folio.

The *Life of Longfellow*, by his brother, Samuel Longfellow (reviewed in the September PRINCETON), has had a large sale.

Those who recall the extensive popularity, a generation since, of Martin Farquhar Tupper's *Proverbial Philosophy*, may be interested in his autobiography, *My Life as an Author*. His reminiscences extend over more than seventy years. He was twice in America.

Colonel Burton's admirable translation of *The Arabian Nights*, which, from its completeness and closeness to the original, was deemed unfit for general publication and issued to subscribers only, is now offered in a chastened edition for the household. This is dedicated by Lady Burton to the women of England, "in the belief that the majority can appreciate fine English and exquisite poetry, and romantic Eastern life, just as well as the thousand students and scholars who secured the original thousand copies."

This is the jubilee year of the *Pickwick Papers*, and Messrs. Macmillan issued a special edition to mark the event.

New translations of Homer appear every year, in the apparently vain attempt to represent adequately to English ears the true qualities of the Homeric rhythm. Not long since Mr. Smith Wright essayed hexameters, following the views of that severe critic of his father's translation, Mr. Matthew Arnold. More recently Mr. A. S. Way has completed a translation of twelve books of the *Iliad*, in the metre of *Sigurd*, as fittest to make on Northern natures the Homeric martial impression. Triplets are freely introduced, and the brightness and quickness of the movement is well-suited to scenes of rapid and heroic action.

MISCELLANEOUS. — Little progress has been made toward the furtherance of international copyright. The Senate Committee on Patents report favorably Senator Chase's bill, slightly modified. It requires manufacture in this country, and forbids importation.

Congress has at last authorized the construction of a new building for the Congressional Library. The bill passed the House April 5. The estimated cost is $2,323,600, including some $500,000 for the site. The building is to be 450 by 300 feet, nearly three acres in area, and will accommodate 4,000,000 volumes.

The report of the Astor Library for 1885 makes the number of readers for the year 72,584; the volumes added, 6,852; the outlay for books and binding, $24,376. The library now has about 221,000 volumes, and invested funds to the amount of $1,412,374.

The authorities of the British Museum are issuing a very valuable catalogue of ancient MSS. in the Museum. Two parts recently published present a "detailed account, with facsimiles, of Greek and Latin works in papyri and codices earlier than the close of the ninth century." Among the Greek MSS. are the Bankes and Harris' papyri of the *Iliad*, the papyri of Hyperides, the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Codex Purpurens.

A *Catalogue of the Hebrew MSS. in Oxford*, by Dr. A. Neubauer, is nearly ready. It describes more than 2,600 codices, and is accompanied by an atlas of forty facsimiles, to illustrate the various characters of rabbinical writing.

A MS. of the fifth or sixth century, containing homilies of Priscillian (executed 385 A. D.), has been brought to light in the University Library of Würzburg. A document of this age, with its numerous Biblical quotations, will furnish valuable material for the history of the canon.

The Archduke Joseph of Austria has

completed and submitted to the Budapesth Academy of Sciences the manuscript of a grammar of the Gypsy language, a work possessing great interest.

The Johns Hopkins University celebrated its tenth anniversary April 26. An account of the exercises and the addresses made by professors in the various departments appeared in the *University Circulars*, Nos. 49–50.

The University of Heidelberg celebrated its quincentenary this summer. On the occasion honorary degrees were conferred, among others, on Henri Taine, Prof. Henry Sweet, and in America on Prof. A. G. Bell, Prof. E. D. Cope, of Philadelphia, Prof. O. C. Marsh, of Yale, Prof. Simon Newcomb, and Prof. J. W. Powell, Director of the Geological Survey.

Dr. Timothy Dwight, since 1858 Professor of Sacred Literature in the Yale Divinity School, was inaugurated President of Yale College, July 1, to succeed Dr. Porter. By the terms of his acceptance he is not required to give instruction or to conduct the discipline of the college. Presidents Eliot and McCosh were present on the occasion.

PERSONAL.—Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, visiting England this summer after many years, has been the recipient everywhere of marked attentions, Oxford, Cambridge, and Edinburgh each conferring on him the degree of Doctor of Laws.

Mr. Matthew Arnold has been in this country this summer. He delivered an address before the students of the University of Pennsylvania on June 8.

Mr. Edmund Gosse has been reëlected for three years as Clarke Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Prof. A. H. Sayce succeeds Professor Skeat as President of the London Philological Society.

M. Edouard Naville, the eminent Egyptologist and discoverer of Pithom, has been decorated by the Emperor of Germany in honor of the completion of his great work, the comparative edition of *The Ritual, or Book of the Dead.*

Prof. E. Zeller, of Berlin, the historian of Greek Philosophy, reached the fiftieth anniversary of his doctorate August 25. His friends and former pupils presented him with a bust of himself.

Gustav Freytag, the German novelist, was seventy years old July 13. His portrait is to be painted at state expense.

NECROLOGY.—April 9.—Victor von Scheffel, aged sixty; the most noteworthy among contemporary German poets. His *Der Trompeter von Säckingen* (1855) has run through many editions.

April 19.—Mr. Sampson Low, London publisher, at 89. He was the originator, in 1837, of *The Publishers' Circular.*

May 23.—Dr. Leopold von Ranke, in the ninety-first year of his age; for sixty-one years professor in the University of Berlin, and accounted foremost among modern historians; celebrated for the thoroughness of his investigation, the breadth of his knowledge—no other historian being competent to speak with authority on the history of so many periods and nations—and for his fundamental conception of history as dealing with mental and moral forces underlying the outward phenomena of history. His *Lives of the Popes* (1834) first gave him a wide reputation, and was reviewed by Macaulay in *The Edinburgh Review.* His life-work he designed to be a Universal History, of which six volumes have appeared, ending with the fall of the Carlovingian Empire. A seventh volume is left ready for publication, besides which there is a mass of material which it is expected Ranke's coadjutor, Professor Wiedemann, will make use of to complete the work as projected.

May 24.—Prof. Dr. Georg Waitz, historian, in Berlin, at seventy-three; a *collaborateur* in Ranke's *Annals*, and successor to M. Pertz as director of the publishing of the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica.* His best-known work is his *History of the German Constitution*, in eight volumes, 1843–78.

May 28.—Mr. John Russell Bartlett, of Providence, R. I., in his eighty-first year. He wrote on Ethnology, on the Literature of our Civil War, several works relating to the history of Rhode Island; but best known in his *Dictionary of Americanisms.*

June 16.—Mr. Edwin Percy Whipple, in Boston, aged sixty-seven; among the first of American essayists and critics; of his seven published volumes, *Literature and Life* appeared in 1849, *The Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* in 1869.

July 17.—Paul Hamilton Hayne, poet, at Copse Hill, Ga., in his fifty-seventh year; a frequent contributor to periodicals. A complete edition of his poems appeared in 1882.

July 21.—Dr. Max Duncker, of Berlin, historian, aged seventy-five; best known is his *Geschichte des Alterthums*, translated into English by Evelyn Abbot, in six volumes.

August 7.—Dr. Wilhelm Scherer, Professor in the University of Berlin, in his forty-sixth year. When only twenty-seven he was appointed Professor of German Language and Literature in Vienna. His *History of German Literature* has become a national work in Germany, and has been recently translated into English and received with much favor.

August 22.—Prof. Calvin E. Stowe, husband of Harriet Beecher Stowe, at eighty-four. He wrote extensively on Biblical subjects.

September 27.—Mr. John Esten Cooke, at his home, near Boyce, Va.; born in 1830; author of many novels, dealing mostly with Virginia life, and of a History of Virginia in the American Commonwealth series.

ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

In both Upper and Lower EGYPT the work of excavation continues. The great Sphinx at Gizeh has been found to occupy the centre of an amphitheatre which forms a kind of rocky basin, with walls cut by the hand of man. The débris about the temple at Luxor is being cleared away, and at Thebes M. Maspero found an untouched tomb of the 20th dynasty.—The mummies of Rameses I. and Rameses II. were unrolled at Boulak, June 1, and that of Seti I., June 9.—M. Maspero has resigned his post at Boulak, and is succeeded by M. Grébault.—A letter of Mr. Petrie to the Academy, June 26, describes the important excavations of the Egyptian Exploration Fund at Defenneh, the Biblical Tahpanhes, the Daphnæ of classical antiquity. Of importance are the discovery of the palace-fort of Psamtik I., identified with "Pharaoh's house in Tahpanhes" (Jer. xliii. 9), and of fine Greek vases of unusual style.

In ASIA MINOR, Mr. Haynes, who in previous years accompanied the American expedition to Assos and the Wolfe expedition to Babylonia, has been photographing Hittite remains and early Christian churches in Lycaonia and Pisidia.—In Pergamon the German excavations have been brought to a close, and will be described in a great work, entitled *The Antiquities of Pergamon*.—The ruins of an ancient city have been discovered by Doctor Fabricius to the northwest of Pergamon, amongst which are the remains of small sanctuaries and a theatre of remarkable plan.—In GREECE, Doctor Doerpfeld, who had been commissioned by the Archæological Institute of Berlin to excavate on the site of the ancient temple at Corinth, has ascertained its ground-plan and the site of the statue. The temple was probably double, that is, dedicated to two divinities.—The Archæological Institute of America has raised $25,000 to erect a building for the American school at Athens. Plans have been prepared by Professor Ware, of Columbia College. A site adjoining that of the English school has been presented by the Greek Government. The English school, after plans by Mr. Penrose, has now been erected.—The centralization and reorganization of the museums of Athens has led to a publication entitled *The Museums of Athens*, which will describe the recent excavations on the Acropolis and the contents of the Athenian museums. The text, furnished by M. Kavvadias, superintendent of the excavations, will be in French, German, English, and Greek.—Excavations in ITALY have brought to light some fine statues. In particular may be mentioned a marble figure of Bacchus, one of the finest in existence, found in the barracks of the Equites Singulares. In the Forum of Augustus was found a group representing the three Graces; on the ground belonging to the Banca Nazionale a statue of Antinous, and in the Via Tasso a statue of the youthful Bacchus of the school of Praxiteles.—In the Campo Verano sepulchral chambers have been found, vaulted and decorated in the style of the first century. The door of lead, swinging on two hinges, was found complete. The Vatican Library has revealed eight new original designs of Sandro Botticelli for the *Divina Commedia* of Dante. This completes the set of 84 now in the Berlin Museum.—The Imperial Academy of Fine Arts of Russia has decided to establish a Russian Academy at Rome.

In ENGLAND the Indian and Colonial Exhibition at South Kensington, and the Exhibition at Liverpool, have excited a public interest in Eastern and especially English colonial handiwork. Special local exhibitions have been held at Brighton, Folkestone, Matlock, Bath, and Wakefield, and an Archæological Society and Museum established at Chester. At public sale have been dispersed the water-color drawings and sketches of Richard Doyle and of Randolph Caldecott, and the pictures, porcelains, and miniatures of the Blenheim Collection.—At Christ College, Cambridge, fine old stained glass has been discovered, representing a three-quarter-length figure of Edward the Confessor, a seated figure of Gregory the Great, a half-length figure, probably of Henry VI., and two royal figures kneeling. These will be placed in the windows of Christ College Chapel.—In FRANCE the Louvre has been enriched by the arrival of 215 cases of Persian antiquities returned by M. Dieulafoy from his excavation of the palaces of Artaxerxes and Darius at Susa. The collection comprises a bicephalous capital, enamel faience, a large number of engraved stones, seals, and cylinders, Susian inscriptions, bronze and terracotta statuettes, vases, and minor objects.—A new course upon the history of painting, given by M. Lafenestre, has been added to the valuable course already offered at the Louvre.—M. Heuzey has resigned his position in the Assyrian department, and has been succeeded by M. Edmond Pottier.—A new hall has been opened in the Trocadero for casts of monuments of Southern and Central France. A Museum of Decorative Art has been projected, with a building to cost 8,000,000 francs. Of this sum 3,500,000 francs will be contributed by the Union Centrale des Arts Décoratifs.—The Duc d'Aumale has given to the Institut de France the famous chateau of Chantilly, with its art collections, forests, and farms. The gift is valued at about 30 million francs. The exhibition at Limoges, opened May 10, has excited considerable interest. Here are gathered several hundred specimens of the famous enamel work, besides manuscripts, arms, pottery, glass, tapestry, embroidery, lace, furniture, wood and ivory

carving.—Monuments have been erected to Diderot, Gambetta, Lamartine, and Berlioz, and the temporary quadriga on the Arc de Triomphe has been removed.—In GERMANY the special exhibition of the Royal Academy of Fine Arts comprised about 1200 modern German and 400 foreign paintings, 200 works of sculpture, 200 water-color drawings, and 150 architectural subjects.—The publications of the Imperial Archæological Institute have been reorganized, and now centre at Berlin, with Rome and Athens as branches. The *Antike Denkmäler* will replace the *Monumenti Inediti.* The *Jahrbuch*, issued quarterly, will take the place of the *Archäologische Zeitung.* Besides these will appear the *Mittheilungen, Römische Abtheilung*, to replace the *Annali* and *Bulletino*, and the *Athenische Abtheilung* for the work at Athens.

NECROLOGY.—The month of May took away the artist Ed. Frère, whose pictures contributed to the joy of many households. July removed the celebrated Bavarian artist Piloty, who counted Defregger and Makart amongst his pupils, and whose "Thusnelda in Triumphzuge des Germanicus" and "Seni vor Wallenstein's Leiche" adorn the walls of the Neue Pinakothek in Munich. July also removed Maxime Lalanne, distinguished for his etching, and F. E. Simon, the inventor of chromo-lithography. In August we mourned the loss of our own art historian and critic, Charles C. Perkins. His *Tuscan Sculptors* appeared in 1864; *Italian Sculptors*, 1868; *Historical Handbook of Italian Sculpture*, 1883; *Ghiberti*, 1886. At the time of his death he was engaged in editing a new *Cyclopædia of Painters and Paintings.*

ANALYTICAL INDEX.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.—Two new features will be noted in the index—first, to the ordinary analytical arrangement is added a classification of each subject a second time under the head of the *general* subject to which it contributes, giving analysis of each article, as, for instance, *Public Questions*, *Literature*, *Art and Archæology*, *Science*, *History*, *Religion and Morals*, *Philosophy*, *Education*. The utility of this addition will be readily seen by a reference to any one of these general headings, enabling one at a glance to review the *whole field* under that head. Second, as an economy of time, dates and amounts are introduced, wherever practical, in the index itself. Special attention also has been given to the system of cross-reference, placing each item under as many different titles as may be appropriate to the subject.